The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1888.

The Week.

THERE appears to be more or less anxiety in England about Lord Salisbury's delay in filling Lord Sackville's place at Washington, lest it should cause some sort of irritation here. Lord Dunraven's pathetic appeal in the House of Lords was based on the assumption that the American public is waiting eagerly for news of a new appointment, and will exhibit vexation in some serious form if their wishes remain much longer ungratified. In fact, he appeared to think that the good relations of the two countries might be put in grave peril by further postponement. Similar alarm has been expressed on behalf of the British people by that irascible old Tory gentleman, Mr. George W. Smalley, who is evidently suffering a good deal from suppressed emotion about the whole matter. We feel bound to say that we see no sign whatever of any deep concern about it in this country. We think it would be very difficult to find a dozen Americans having any work to do, who care one straw whether the vacancy in the British Legation is filled now or six months hence, or who are in the smallest degree opposed to Lord Salisbury's consulting his own convenience in the matter. Indeed, we might go further, and say that probably nine-tenths of the American public do not know at any given date whether there is a British Minister in Washington or not, and would be unable to say, without preparation, what the use of a British Minister resident in Washington was. Lord Sackville's life there during the last six or seven years was so quiet, unobtrusive, and uneventful, he said so little and did so little, that we think his absence from his post during the whole period would have passed unnoticed outside the newspaper offices. The idea, therefore, that the public here will feel angry or ill-used if a successor to him be not promptly sent out, is almost amusing. Lord Salisbury may feel assured that he runs no risk of unpleasantness of any description in taking all the time he needs. The only British representative in Washington who attracts popular attention is the special envoy who is sent out when there is any important business to be transacted, like the Marquis of Ripon and Sir Stafford Northcote, who came out to negotiate the Treaty of Washington, or Mr. Chamberlain, who came out to negotiate the Fisheries Treaty. The permanent representative who remains here in ordinary times for ordinary purposes, is not the object of any interest or curiosity, and is seldom mentioned except in the "society column" of the newspapers.

The bill which Mr. Holman has introduced in Congress, designed to prevent the use of money in national elections, lacks the one provision which is vitally necessary to its success in practice, in case it ever becomes a law. As it stands, the measure is simply a sweeping prohibition of both the raising and the using of money for other than the necessary expenses of elections. It makes it unlawful for any person to solicit or receive, directly or indirectly, or be in any manner connected with or concerned in soliciting or receiving, any assessment, subscription, or contribution of money or of anything of value, to be expended, used, or employed in any manner whatever in any national election, or in the political canvass immediately preceding the same, to control in any manner or to in any wise influence any such election or the result thereof. It also makes it unlawful for any person to contribute in any manner either money or any other thing of value to be used to influence an election. The provisions are very stringent, and the penalty which is fixed for their violation is very heavy, namely, disfranchisement and disqualification from holding office for five years, and also liability to a fine of not more than $5,000 and imprisonment for not more than three years.

Yet, stringent as the measure is, it is scarcely more so than one which has been on the statute-book of the State of New York since 1842, and has been practically a dead letter since the hour of its enactment (Chapter 130 of the Law of 1842, sec. 400.) This law, if enforced, would secure precisely what Mr. Holman's bill aims at; but it has never been enforced, for the simple reason that, while it allows for defraying certain necessary expenses of elections, it places no limit to such expenses, and requires no publication of them after election. Mr. Holman's bill, after absolutely prohibiting all contributions and expenditures, in its first two sections, opens wide the door to both by saying in its third section that "the foregoing sections shall not be construed as applying to any money received and expended in good faith under the laws of any State or Territory for the necessary expenses of any election, or to money so received and expended for the printing of tickets, or in the publication of any newspaper or other publication, or for the distribution thereof." The Wanamakers and Quays would not have the slightest difficulty in continuing their operations on the old plan in future campaigns under this section of Mr. Holman's bill. They could say, as they do now, that they were merely attending to the "necessary expenses," could burn their records and vouchers, and snap their fingers at the stringent prohibitory provisions of the first two sections. There is only one thing which they and their kind would fear, and that would be a law requiring the publication, after election, of a sworn statement, accompanied by vouchers, showing every dollar received, and the use to which it was put. The English Corrupt Practices Act is an excellent guide to follow on this point, for it has worked most successfully from the moment of going into operation. The requirement of publication of expenditures did what the most stringent prohibitory measures against bribery could not do and never can do—abolished the corrupt use of money immediately; the secret ballot, of course, aiding greatly in the work. Unless Mr. Holman puts a similar requirement into his bill, it will not be worth the paper it is written on.

The American Copyright League is about to make an effort to have the Chace-Breckinridge International Copyright Bill taken up again in the present session of Congress. It has issued a deadly parallel, showing who are the principal supporters and who the principal opponents of the bill. The showing is rather a poor one for the latter. We have before us an anonymous circular, probably issued by some one of the parties of the second part in the parallel, dated December 4, containing a characteristic appeal to the working printers against the bill. We do not know where to look for such direct incitements to dishonesty as are to be found in documents of this character. In our day, incitements to theft or fraud are all given orally, except among the opponents of international copyright. They now monopolize the discredit of issuing printed arguments in support of the doctrine that dishonesty is the best policy. The paper before us shows how much money working printers make, and how much American readers save, by robbing foreign authors. Almost every word of it, however, could be used in support of a well-conceived plan for swindling clothiers, supposing there were no legal penalty for such an offence. That is, the clothiers are a small body, while the wearers of the clothing are an immense body. Men must have clothing, they cannot go naked; and the practice of charging money for clothes puts an impediment in the way of the satisfaction of an absolutely necessary and most salutary want on the part of people of small means. One of the funniest parts of the circular is that which pleads against depriving the foreign author of the "popularity" he now enjoys through the cheapness of his printed books. If he were paid for his copyright, says the pamphleteer, fewer of his books would be read, and then where would be his "popularity"? This argument might also be turned against the clothier. A clothier who got nothing for his goods would, if he stayed in the business, soon be the most popular man in the United States. The practice of paying for them necessarily limits the extent to which he is known and admired, and exposes him to the charge of selfishness.

We do not believe such appeals can have any effect on working printers or any other class of intelligent men. The only way they can be led astray is by having it represented to them that international copyright in some way offends against the doctrine of pro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tection to native industry. This the Chace bill does not do. It compels foreign authors to print their books here; it reduces the amount of printing to be done in this country only in so far as it respects the ordinary laws of morality. It is, of course, cheaper to steal a book than to buy one. There is no getting over the fact that goods in the open market cost more than goods in the store of "a fence"; but we do believe they are mistaken who think they can make this consideration a powerful one in the eyes of American workingmen. They are, like all men following honest callings, interested above all things in seeing that every one gets the reward of his labor, and that the stranger is not stripped of his possessions as soon as he touches our shores.

In one of the 'Political Essays' by James Russell Lowell, written years ago, which have recently been gathered together, he said: "To be told that we ought not to agitate the question of slavery when it is that which is forever agitating us, is like telling a man with the fever and ague on him to stop shaking and he will be cured. The discussion of slavery is said to be dangerous, but dangerous to what?" Then, to illustrate the absurdity of the slaveholders' position by presenting an even greater absurdity, he added: "The manufacturers of the Free States constitute a more numerous class than the slaveholders of the South: suppose they should claim an equal sanctity for the protective system." Less than thirty years have passed since these words were written, but the illustration no longer serves its purpose. A sanctity is now claimed for the protective system which makes its supporters deprecate agitation and discussion as dangerous.

Some of the Washington newspaper correspondents are seeking to belittle the efforts of the Democratic Senators to resist the progress of the Senate Tariff Bill. We see no justice in this criticism. It was a misfortune that Senator Beck, to whom the leadership of the opposition had been committed, should have fallen ill just as his services were most wanted in that capacity. But a surprisingly good defence under the circumstances has been made by Senators Vest, Reagan, Saulsbury, Vance, and McPherson, although the latter has been overweighted by his own bias in favor of protection. It is not necessary that every item should be fought over, nor is it desirable that a factious opposition should be made to the bill. It is only requisite that the character of the measure should be duly exposed. This has been done so far as progress has been made, and will be done, we have no doubt, as long as the bill remains in the Senate.

In the debate on the Senate Tariff Bill, the duty on wire rods being under consideration, Senator Vest read a communication from the New Haven Wire Company asking for a reduction of the duty on steel rods from six-tenths to four-tenths of a cent per pound. The New Haven company represented that they and about twenty other wire-mills in the country were compelled to pay either a duty of 45 per cent. ad valorem to the Government on imported rods, or a bonus of that amount to American manufacturers of the same; that the wire-mills employed more labor than the rod-makers, and that they had learned that a movement was on foot to increase the duty on rods to 55 per cent., or a specific rate equivalent to that, against which they desired strongly to protest. They said that "they now need protection, not against foreign competition, but against the high charges of the American rod-mills." The cost of steel from which rods are made was stated to be $28 to $28.50 per ton, and the cost of turning the steel into wire rods $8 per ton, making the cost of the rods $36 to $36.50 per ton, while the selling price of rods is $41 to $41.50 per ton—a profit of $5 per ton. A rod-mill can turn out easily seventy-five tons per day, and under such conditions can make a net profit of $100,000 per year—in other words, can nearly pay for itself in one year. There are now nine rod-mills in operation in the country, with an aggregate capacity of 250,000 tons per annum, and they are all fully employed. If the present duty on wire rods were reduced one-half, say the petitioners, the Pittsburgh rod-mills could still sell their rods at a profit and keep the foreign rods out of the market west of the Alleghenies, "while at the same time the seaboard wire-mills, which are prevented by inland freights from using American rods, and are compelled to pay the present duty on their foreign rods, would have some hope of life." This appeal for life met no countenance on the part of the Senate. Although the petitioners were manufacturers, and therefore presumably entitled to more consideration than other people, although they were larger employers of labor than the rod-mills, and therefore presumably more in sympathy with the working classes, yet, as they were plainly opposed to the prevailing practice of robbing Peter to pay Paul, they were sent away with nothing but a piece of cold shoulder. All this while the Government is straining every nerve to reduce the revenue.

The movement among American actors to have themselves covered by the Contract Labor Act would probably have been regarded as a practical joke if men like Edwin Booth and Lawrence Barrett were not found taking part in it. Observing this, one begins to feel that they were not unduly alarmed who saw in the warfare of the mechanics' trades unions against superior excellence or diligence among their own members, the beginning of an attack on civilization itself. The human race has been carried out of forest savagery into peace and comfort by the success of some men in effecting improvements in the arts which the bulk of their fellows would never have thought of; and nations have been carried forward in the same way by letting in light from every surrounding nation. The reason China has been stagnant for four or five thousand years is that each generation has insisted on doing what its fathers did, and has treated any one who proposed to do better or differently as a "foreign devil." The reason why Europe has gone forward is that Greece learned from Egypt, and Rome learned from Greece, and all the modern European nations have learned from each other, and are learning more and more every day. One finds it very difficult, therefore, to treat seriously any proposal to take the United States out of this magnificent competition of civilized peoples for the foremost places in the arts, in the sciences, and in literature.

The insatiableness of protection has always been one of the favorite arguments of free-traders against high tariff. They have always maintained, and they maintain every year with increasing force, that you can never satisfy a protected industry with anything short of prohibition; that the more it is protected, the more timid, inert, and unenergetic it becomes, and the greater the terror of "the foreigner" in which it lives. But we believe no free-trade apostle ever dreamed, until the demand for protection against foreign pictures was made in this country a few years ago, that the protectionist doctrine was so contagious that it would make its way into the world of ideas, and would demand the exclusion of foreign truth, and beauty, and eloquence, and poetry, and wit, by custom-house officers. American artists have actually come forward and demanded that the law shall prevent American citizens from owning or even seeing any better pictures than their own. We have heard an American publisher of high standing argue warmly in favor of the exclusion of English books, on the ground that adult Americans would read them and have their minds injured thereby. And now we have American actors demanding a protected stage, so that American adults shall not be permitted to see any actors who are more carefully trained, or whose manners or elocution are better than their own. To bring this about we are told Edwin Booth is "putting his shoulder to the wheel"; and Lawrence Barrett is "entering heart and soul." In other words, we are threatened with a new China towards the close of the nineteenth century, on the soil occupied by "Time's latest offspring."

"A member of the [theatrical] profession" said last week in the *Tribune*:

"Our attitude towards the foreign actor is precisely that of the American people towards the Chinese. Why do we keep out the Chinese? Not that we've got any personal feeling against the little Mongolian. Why, bless you, the little fellow is quiet, industrious, unobtrusive, raises no rows, always attends to his own business, and lets ours alone; but he simply comes here to get our money and take it home when he gets enough. He never becomes one of us, therefore we don't want him."

The "member" knew well that he was departing from the truth when he said this. He does not really want the English actor to settle here and become "one of us," simply because he thinks the Englishman is the better actor, and for that reason and no other would "get our money." Besides, it is not bad actors' money the good foreign actor gets,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

but the money of playgoers who want the best acting the money will bring, and have no idea of going to a play simply in order that bad American actors may be able to earn a livelihood. The truth is, a bad actor, such as the "member" probably is, is not entitled to a livelihood or to anybody's money. He is one of the most useless of created beings—far more useless than any Chinaman—and ought to be hunted into some honest calling, if in no other way, by open competition.

Washington is full of rumors about the political future of Mr. James G. Blaine, the sum and substance of which are that he cannot have a "Cabinet position," but can have, and probably will be content with, the Mission to England. The Mission to England will not, however, be completely at the disposal of President Harrison. The English Government have to be satisfied with the appointee, and it is very certain that Mr. Blaine would not be received at the Court of St. James, even if he had the brass to present himself there. The Madison Square speech at Pat Ford's meeting, and his notorious alliance with that particular dynamiter, would make it difficult for any civilized Government to receive him, and impossible for that of Great Britain. We feel sure he knows this very well himself, and if he is working for the English Mission it is probably simply in order to have the honor of refusing it before going into retirement. The Turkish Mission would probably suit him better than any, because Constantinople is the only capital in Europe where he would not be found out and where his stories would pass current.

Gen. Harrison was harassed with a particularly pertinacious batch of politicians on Friday, who went to him to urge the claims of various Cabinet aspirants. To one of them who had told him that nine-tenths of the Republicans in New England desired to see Mr. Blaine in the Cabinet, he exclaimed: "I don't think I ought to be crowded into appointing men because other men think they have a claim on me on account of their services to the party." To that precious pair of Platt advocates from New York, ex-Speaker Erwin and Senator Vedder, who were trying to convince him that "Tom" had carried the State for him, Gen. Harrison said: "I propose to recognize no factions in the Republican party. I shall do all I can to heal factional disputes and make the Republican party united and harmonious." These two utterances, which are sent out by many correspondents, and are apparently of undoubted authenticity, had the natural effect of dampening the ardor of the whole army of place-hunters. The man who was advocating Blaine as the Favorite Son of New England admitted sorrowfully, after the interview was over, that the General's manner when Blaine was under discussion was not favorable. "I got the idea," he said, "that Mr. Blaine will not go into the Cabinet."

If the great Republican principle that Cabinet office should be given first of all to those aspirants whom the Mugwumps most severely criticise were to prevail, President Harrison's Cabinet would necessarily include the following: James G. Blaine, John Wanamaker, T. C. Platt, W. W. Dudley, William Mahone, Pat Ford, and Wharton Barker. That is a full set; they are all candidates, and are all known to be looked upon with more or less disapproval by the Mugwumps; and yet we are afraid that there is not a Republican newspaper in the country sufficiently loyal to advocate the adoption of the entire batch by the President. Now, this ought not to be the case, if Mugwump hostility be the true guide to Republican goodness and greatness which such cool and sagacious minds as that of Charles Emory Smith have solemnly assured us it is. There must be something wrong in a principle which breaks down under so simple a test as this.

The way the Philadelphia newspapers throw their shields round "John Wanamaker," as they affectionately call him, is both touching and diverting. Even those who are most opposed to bribery and corruption at elections, and are readiest to suspect it in other places, cannot be persuaded that any of the money which their John raised went in any such wicked ways—he is such a "respectable business man," you know, and such a "valuable church member." Of course the uncharitable smile when one expresses surprise or sorrow at this, and remark that the quality of advertising is not strained; that it droppeth like the gentle rain from heaven on the place beneath; that it is thrice blessed, it blesseth him that gives, and him that takes; or, in other words, that John surrounds himself with a subsidized public opinion, which holds him harmless in Philadelphia. How far this is true, we have no means of knowing, and do not care to discuss; but we will make one remark at which no one can take offence. In all other great civilized Christian cities that we know of, a respectable business man and valuable church member, when his use of a large sum of other people's money is criticized, answers his assailants and confounds them by *publishing his accounts and vouchers*. This is the rule and practice of religion and morality, as well as the custom of merchants. It ought to be the rule of politics; and any Christian man who, handling political money, refuses to obey it, because it is not the law of the land, brings reproach upon himself, on his church, and his country, and makes his journalistic apologists ridiculous.

The South Carolina Legislature adjourned on Saturday night without having adopted the proposition to submit a constitutional amendment establishing an educational test, and the same fate appears likely to befall the similar scheme in Alabama. Outside those States the project has not received much support, and there has been no little opposition in the press of the two States. The general opinion appears to be that, suffrage having been once given to everybody, no attempt at placing an educational restriction upon its exercise will ever be carried through.

Apparently the bulk of Osman Digna's forces were not engaged in the fight at Suakim on Wednesday week, but the British success has certainly steadied public opinion in England as to the expediency of holding the town, and will very likely determine the Government to take possession of it, in the Queen's name, instead of keeping it as now in the Khedive's. The neighboring tribes, it is supposed, would not object to its becoming British territory. What they — apart from the slave-dealers—are resisting in attacking it, is an attempt to reëstablish Egyptian domination on the upper Nile. To this all accounts agree they will never submit. It was the badness of the Egyptian rule which produced the Mahdi, and converted the Sudanese into the fierce warriors they have shown themselves to be ever since 1882. Sir John Adye, the chief of Lord Wolseley's staff in the Egyptian campaign, and sometime Governor of Gibraltar, writes to the London *Times* to say that, while Zebehr Pasha, a noted Sudanese chief, was a prisoner at Gibraltar he repeatedly told him that this was the real root of the hostility of the tribes to the British garrison at Suakim, and intimated that if it were known to them for certain that the British were not acting for the Egyptians, accommodation might be easy.

The triennial elections for the Norwegian Storthing have resulted disastrously for the Sverdrup Ministry. The two groups of the Left, the Moderates or Ministerialists and the Radicals, have been waging war to the knife in the press and on the hustings, and have preferred to wreck their party rather than to unite on a policy which both might be able to support. The next Storthing, which will meet in February, 1889, will have 54 Conservatives, 22 Moderates, and 38 Radicals. Efforts will undoubtedly be made to patch up some sort of compromise between the two groups of the Left, and some of the objectionable members of the Ministry, notably Jacob Sverdrup, the Premier's nephew, Minister of Ecclesiastical Affairs, will probably be sacrificed in order to save the rest. Such a compromise would, however, be a precarious experiment, and would scarcely be respected long. The hostility of the Radicals to Sverdrup is so bitter that they will let no opportunity slip to repay him for the humiliation he has inflicted upon them. They attribute to his machinations the defeat of their three ablest leaders, who all failed of reëlection. The middle course which the Ministry has chosen, between clamorous demands of the Radicals for manhood suffrage and ecclesiastical reform and the conservative sentiment of the peasantry, who demand economy in administration and lightening of the burden of taxation, has apparently failed to satisfy either party. The probable result will be a return of the Conservatives to power before the session is far advanced.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

OUR POOR UNPROTECTED STAGE.

THE infantile cry for protection raised by some of our native actors amounts to nothing less than an acknowledgment of hopeless inferiority, and no other interpretation will be put upon it by the general public. All pretences of a patriotic or philanthropic motive are too shallow to deceive any intelligent or unprejudiced person for a moment; and it is to be hoped that the few eminent performers who have permitted their names to be associated with this extraordinary exhibition of pusillanimity may be able to appreciate this fact, and reconsider their course before further damage is done to their artistic reputations. It is useless to try to befog the point at issue. The restrictions asked for must operate, and are doubtless intended to operate, not only against "leading men," as they are called in theatrical jargon, and companies imported for the support of foreign stars, but against the foreign stars themselves. There is not a manager in the country who does not understand this fully, and the managers who support the movement do so because the only possible result of it must be the exclusion of all first-class foreign dramatic performances from these shores.

Their policy is based upon an argument as simple as it is selfish and despicable. Put into plain words, it would be something like this: "Mr. Irving comes here, and takes away money which ought to go into our pockets. His success is due largely to his splendidly trained company. To legislate against him personally would be too barefaced an outrage; let us rather shut his company out, and then offer him a hearty fraternal welcome." They know, of course, that Mr. Irving, or any other player of his rank, would scout the idea of collecting a new cast out of the theatrical odds and ends floating about in Union Square, and that, even if he could be willing to descend to an expedient so unworthy of his high aims, he could not afford the time for organization and rehearsal. They know too, none better, that this unhappy public has suffered too greatly from the domestic combinations of stars and sticks to hunger after foreign mixtures of a similar kind. The rule which they propose would apply equally to all nationalities, and they would be well pleased, doubtless, if they could compel M. Coquelin, Herr Possart, and others to draw their support from the waiters in the restaurants or the beer-saloons.

The complaint that "leading men" are imported from England in large numbers, to the exclusion of native "talent," would be justified if there was any evidence of favoritism in the matter. But there is nothing of the sort, the fact being that the supply of the American article falls far short of the demand. Nor is the reason far to seek. There is no natural quality in an Englishman to make him peculiarly fit to impersonate the heroes of old or modern comedy. The American is as fair to look upon, is as well equipped in respect of lungs and limbs, and is certainly not inferior in respect of average intelligence. How, then, does it come about that young Englishmen succeed in securing so many of the best positions in a business conducted by men notoriously devoid of sentiment? The only possible answer is that they are more competent than their American brethren; and it is equally clear that their superiority must be due, in most cases, not to natural gifts, but to their training.

It has been suggested that the English actor carries with him a certain air of social distinction, traceable to his familiarity with the more formal manners of an older civilization; but in this there is a large element of humbug. The fiction that the stage-player is the idol of the British court or camp has no surer foundation than the fancy of the press-agent. Some of them have been educated in the public schools, a few in the universities, one or two at Sandhurst; but, speaking generally, the English actor has no social opportunities beyond the reach of the American actor. There is no monopoly of good manners nowadays on either side of the Atlantic, and the main difference between a London and a New York drawing-room is geographical. The vital point, moreover, is not whether an actor is a gentleman in his behavior in his private capacity, but whether he can deport himself as a gentleman upon the stage, where his conduct is not natural, except in appearance, but artificial. The veriest Chesterfield in a ballroom might be mistaken for a boor before the footlights. What is wanted here is not so much a school for actors as a school for managers. There are plenty of apt pupils, but there is a most woful dearth of teachers.

The force of this remark will scarcely be appreciated except by those readers who chance to have some personal knowledge of the intellectual and moral character of the men who now control the destinies of the American stage. There are not, in the whole country, more than half-a-dozen managers (three of whom are in this city) who are in the least degree entitled to that name in its proper sense, as it would be applied, for instance, to Phelps, Irving, Charles Kean, or Macready. The rest are speculators pure and simple, who know nothing and care nothing about the art by which they make their living; whose sole idea is to make money, "honestly if they can, but by all means to make money"; and who "run" their theatres as the Bowery man "runs" his museum—by sheer force of advertising. Of literature, of history, of archæology, of architecture, of painting, of costume, or of acting, they are as ignorant as Macaulay's fourth-form schoolboy, and they would laugh at anybody who hinted to them that education of any kind was essential to their profession. All they care about is a sensation which will "draw." There is not one of them who would know what to do with a stock company, if he had one, or who could presume to select a play or give a direction at rehearsal. If a piece has been successful in Paris, Berlin, or London, they contract for its production in one or more of their circuit of theatres, and are interested in nothing but the scene plan, which, as a matter of carpentry, they can comprehend. With the play they get their company; or if by any chance they have to cast the piece themselves, they select one or two prominent performers, and fill up the remainder of the list almost at haphazard from such actors as may happen to be disengaged. If the play, on account of a tank, a horse-race, horse-play, dirt, or what not, chances to make a hit, it is sent the round of the country until the receipts fall off, when it is shelved for something else. In the whole experiment there is no thought of art, either with respect to the play or the manner of its representation. At the end of the season, be it long or short, the actors are scattered to pick up their next employment where they can.

Thus it comes to pass that the American actor, except in a few theatres where the stock system still prevails, is never subject for any length of time to intelligent supervision and direction, but is left to his own resources. If he betrays special aptitude for one line of work, he follows that line exclusively, and either becomes a "star" in the narrowest of orbits—before he has learned the rudiments of real acting, whose aim is general impersonation—or drifts into the abysses of general inutility. If he is lucky, he makes a small fortune in a year or two, and becomes too conceited to play second fiddle to anybody. If he is unlucky, he disappears in inglorious and laborious oblivion. From this latter class comes the despairing wail for protection.

The speculative "manager" is at work in England too, but there he is yet in the minority. In that old theatrical centre there is some virtue in the spirit of conservatism. This it is that keeps alive the memories of tradition and forbids the total abandonment of the stock-company system. The actors who come here to be "leading men" are not in the front ranks at home, but they have served some apprenticeship in schools not altogether dead to the influences of the past. They have learned to read moderately well, to assume an air of repose, and to control the rawest impulses of the beginner; they have enjoyed, in short, in some degree, the advantages which are denied to the beginners here. Some of them, perhaps, although this is not so certain, have been benefited by a more liberal general education. In natural ability, however, they are in no way superior to the American raw material. Many of them do not even speak their own language as well as their American rivals; but they are more expert in detail, are more at home in a dress-coat or in ruffles, and are able to mimic, often very feebly, the comedy style handed down from generation to generation. But there is no tradition in London which does not exist here, and there is not the least reason why America should not lead the way in the theatre as in other paths of civilization. After more than a century of acting, with some of the most glorious names on the roll of theatrical fame, to whimper for protection is more than cowardly—it is disgraceful.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE CAUSES OF RAILROAD MISMANAGEMENT.

WITHIN the past three weeks the railroad situation has been publicly reviewed by two of the highest authorities in the country—first by the Inter-State Commerce Commission in its annual report to Congress, and next by Mr. Adams in his speech to the Commercial Club of Boston.

Up to a certain point the two are in harmony. Both agree in laying severe blame upon many of the present methods of railroad management. In a large number of cases, rates are not made with any intelligent regard to the interests of the property. Sometimes the subordinate agents act without control from the general management; oftener still the general management acts without control from the stockholders, if not in open defiance of their interests. The agent, in his desire to do a thriving business, is only too ready to meet a cut rate of a rival, however low. In this system of rate-cutting he is sometimes directly encouraged by his superiors. The directors of our large corporations have other means of making money besides the legitimate operation of the property under their control. Fortunes are more quickly made by stockjobbing than by the slow accumulation of dividends. By borrowing other people's money to build and run railroads for speculative purposes, the manager obtains a chance of gain out of all proportion to his own personal risk. The present loss falls almost wholly on the investor: the ultimate gain, whether the stock rise or fall, will accrue largely to the speculators.

Mr. Adams and the Inter-State Commerce Commission are in full agreement as to the serious character of these evils. Both make them a fundamental cause of existing troubles; but the Commission draws the inference that the Inter-State Commerce Act has not had much to do with producing the present state of things, while Mr. Adams believes that it has. Some critics have gone so far as to accuse him of inconsistency in assigning two separate causes for the same result, sometimes making it depend upon one and sometimes upon the other. We do not think that this criticism is well founded. Mr. Adams's explanation may seem less consistent with itself than that of the Commission; but it is more consistent with the facts. For really there are two sets of causes operating to produce the present crisis: one dependent on the errors of railroad managers, and another upon those of the Inter-State Commerce Act. The two are so closely intermixed that the predominance of one set or the other will largely depend upon the point of view chosen by the observer.

If all railroad managers were angels, the Inter-State Commerce Law would not have the bad effect upon railroad property which it has at present. So much we may readily concede to the Commission; and so far we are justified in laying the blame upon the sins of the managers, rather than upon the act itself. But nobody makes laws upon the supposition that all the people subject to them are going to be angels. In point of fact, railroad managers show the same mixture of good and bad qualities as do other people, some of them being thoroughly honest and competent, some indifferently so, and some conspicuously lacking in one or the other of these respects. Now, taking human nature as we find it, was the law adapted to the needs of the case? Experience indicates that parts of it, at least, were not. The prohibition of pooling destroyed more safeguards than the pains and penalties of the rest of the law were able to create. It has actually resulted in the building of parallel lines and in the demoralization of rates. The Commission tries to show that these were not in any way attributable to the operation of the act; but Mr. Adams gives clear indications that they were.

Pools were by no means an ideal means of securing amicable relations between different roads; but they were the best which the experience of half-a-century had been able to devise, and the only one which had accomplished the object in view with even moderate success. When these were made illegal, the railroad system of the country was placed at the mercy of its most reckless members. If one road inaugurated a fighting policy, it inflicted losses upon other roads, which were equally serious whether they entered the fight or kept out of it. The Commission was unable to grant any relief, and simply went about crying, "Peace, peace!" when there was no peace. This is the state of things to-day; and it is one for which the law is in one sense largely responsible.

We do not attempt to palliate for a moment the action of the more reckless railroad managers; in a recent issue we have ourselves criticised it most severely. But we believe that the effect of the law is to increase these evils, giving the reckless managers more influence, and the conservative managers less, so that the former can dictate the policy to be adopted in large sections of the country. Nor is the prospect for improvement at all promising. To repeal the pooling clause seems out of the question for the present, to reform human nature is almost equally so; but the immediate outlook for the latter is better than for the former. Any means which shall secure real publicity in railroad rates or railroad management is to be welcomed as a powerful aid in this respect.

The proposal for a railroad clearing-house is one which is worthy of careful attention. As far as its operations could go, it would do much good and no possible harm. It is not so radical a measure as many people imagine. When the Southwestern clearing-house was proposed, many of the newspapers described it as a railroad Trust. This was far from the truth. It was not even a railroad pool. It was simply an administrative measure by which rival roads could keep track of one another's operations, and common action could be secured for common ends. So far from being a consolidation of interests, it was intended as a means for rendering such consolidation unnecessary.

Such clearing-houses have existed for about fourteen years in the Southern States, and for over forty years in England. In both cases they have been highly successful. But it should also be said that each of these clearing-houses, in the early stages of its development, was accompanied by a highly organized system of pools. The two things helped one another. It remains to be seen what would be the success of a clearing-house without a pool. So much of our competitive traffic—say from Chicago to New York—is carried over but one system, that it would not enter the clearing-house at all. One set of roads would be held to a greater measure of publicity than another, and the latter would be an object of suspicion to the former. It would require all the ingenuity of our best railroad administrators to meet this difficulty.

Publicity of accounts is no less desirable than publicity of rates. In this respect the workings of the Inter-State Commerce Law may be of decided benefit; but in matters of railroad financiering the public conscience needs education quite as much as the public intellect. Even if stockholders are told pretty accurately what has gone on during the past year, the information often comes too late to do any good. The directors know that it will come too late; and the possibility of future action on the part of the stockholders has little or no deterrent effect. If the public came to regard breach of a director's trust in its true light, it would be quite another thing. When the man who has knowingly, though indirectly, converted investors' funds to his own uses, receives the penalty of social ostracism, and can no longer be associated with financial enterprises of good standing, then the most important of all steps towards railroad reform will have been accomplished. However remote the prospect of this result, it is well worth making the effort to attain it.

THE RAGE FOR OFFICE.

THE cause of the American eagerness to hold office under the Government has been analyzed a great deal, both by political and social philosophers, without any very satisfactory result. It used to be considered a peculiarly American passion, but this theory has, we think, been disposed of by the experience of France under the Third Republic, which indicates that the passion exists in every democracy, and will show itself with great violence whenever the opportunities for gratifying it are sensibly increased. That is, as soon as it becomes plain that everybody who uses certain means has a fair chance of getting into the public service, under any popular government an enormous increase in the number of candidates takes place—an increase so great that it sometimes seems as if half the voting population were place-hunters. Nothing seems to hold this passion in check except absolute hopelessness. The vacancies have to be rare, and the conditions of appointment hard, in order to turn the popular attention away from this mode of gaining a livelihood.

It is not by any means, however, in the character of a means of livelihood that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

office-holding most inflames the popular imagination. As a means of livelihood, in fact, it has but little to recommend it to any man who has character, or capacity, or friends, and is still in the prime of life. The pay is small, and the tenure very precarious, and in this country there is no pension for the superannuated or disabled civil servants. In fact, if it offered nothing but the salary, it would probably lose one-half of its attractiveness. What makes it so seductive in democracies is undoubtedly the fact that it is the only place or business within the reach of the ordinary citizen which confers *distinction*, or, in other words, which seems to raise him above his fellows or mark him out from them as a person peculiarly situated. The same salary in the grocery or dry-goods or hardware business would not confer distinction. It would not mark out the recipient as a man above his fellows. It would not clothe him with any dignity or authority, or put him forward as the representative, or type, or symbol of anything. But as soon as he becomes a postmaster, or custom-house officer, or revenue collector, or marshal, or sheriff, he is at once raised on a pedestal: he seems to stand for the State or nation, and to have been selected by it to bear responsibility and speak with its voice. He is no longer a simple villager, or farmer, or storekeeper; he is raised above them, and forms a separate class, of which he may be the only member.

To appreciate the force of these considerations one has only to remember how ordinary people in a democracy suffer from obscurity. No one knows as much about this as newspaper editors and reporters. Men and women often manage to conceal their passion for notoriety from their immediate friends and acquaintances; but to the editor and reporter it is often revealed, with startling simplicity, that perhaps the worst of human ills, after poverty, disgrace, or disease, is to be "nobody in particular," that is, to be a person who is not talked about, who has no mark of difference from his fellows, and of whom the world outside his home circle has never heard. As a general rule, men and women do not ask or hope for anything that can be called fame; but they live in eager desire for some slight elevation above their neighbors, some distinctive mark, if not of eminence, of meritorious peculiarity or segregation, some sign that by somebody somewhere they are more honored or trusted or observed than the other individuals who compose the public. An office, however humble, furnishes this mark. It makes a man peculiar. It clothes him with a little brief authority. It makes him on some subjects an oracle to his neighbors. It takes him out of the crowd. It secures him the certainty of being pointed out in any small company as a person to whom something off the common has happened, whose life does not run in the ordinary groove, and who is, in short, a local notable.

There is, however, one peculiarity of American office-holding which has the effect in this country of deepening the office-holding passion beyond anything of the kind elsewhere. We mean the theory, born of the spoils system, that every office-holder, however lowly his place, assists in "making the Administration a success," and that, therefore, every administration must, in order to be a success, fill all the offices with "its friends," meaning by "friends" men of the same party. This theory was, in fact, necessary from the beginning, in order to justify the Jacksonian "clean sweep." It would be difficult to justify the wholesale expulsion of clerks, postmasters, letter-carriers, custom-house inspectors, and scrubbing women without maintaining that Democratic clerks would not keep books, and Democratic postmasters would not despatch mails, and Democratic letter-carriers would not sort and deliver letters, and Democratic custom-house officers would not prevent smuggling, and Democratic scrubbing women would not scrub floors, in a proper and efficient manner for a Republican President, or vice versa. Consequently, all the underlings of the Government, however obscure or unimportant their duties may be, are, under the spoils theory, supposed to be sharers with the President and the Cabinet in the work of carrying out the policy of the Administration.

This view took firm hold of the office-holding class in this country, and, though somewhat weakened of late years, is still strong and rife. In England, or even in France, it would seem very ridiculous. If a Liberal post-office clerk in London were to proclaim that he was unwilling to do his letter-sorting properly lest it should help Lord Salisbury to maintain his hold on power, it would be received with shouts of laughter, and he would probably be dismissed as a crank. But there are still thousands of subordinates in our Government service who sincerely hold that they can hardly be expected to discharge their duties properly, and are really unwilling to be efficient, if they do not belong to the same party as the Administration.

The self-importance this gives even a small office-holder is easily understood. It can hardly help lending a little extra strut to his walk, and heightening his tone when he is laying down the law at his boarding-house table. To have a real part in directing or carrying out the policy of a great government makes even $500 a year seem a great salary, and gives dignity, if not splendor, to the duty of scrubbing the floor and cleansing the spittoons. If, too, it makes it hard for a Republican to sort letters or cast up accounts correctly under a Democratic President, it gives the task some of the glorious bitterness of martyrdom. The fact that the work is odious lends it a certain nobleness and elevation, and makes the man who does it feel himself a sufferer in a great cause. It is, of course, just the same, a ridiculous and mischievous delusion which has to be destroyed. The civil service will never be thoroughly reformed until all subordinates in it feel themselves to be heart and soul the servants of the American people, or, in other words, of all taxpayers.

THE CONDITION OF IRELAND AS EXHIBITED BY OFFICIAL STATISTICS.

DUBLIN, December 1, 1888.

THE opening address to the Irish Statistical and Social Enquiry Society was delivered last week by Dr. Thomas Grimshaw, the President, who, both in his official capacity as Registrar General of Ireland and Chief Census Commissioner, and as a private individual long versed in vital and other statistics, is probably the most competent authority on such matters in this country. After reviewing at length the statistics of population, agriculture, trade, education, pauperism, and taxation from 1841 down to the present time, he arrived at the conclusion that, since the great famine of 1846-7, Ireland has advanced more rapidly, and has recovered from a condition of almost total wreck more completely, than any country ever has done. This conclusion is so completely at variance with the popular judgment that one may well hesitate to accept the inference he draws from facts and figures which, if not indisputable, approximate to accuracy as closely as such statistics are capable of doing.

The population of Ireland has fallen from 8,300,000 in 1845 to 4,900,000 in 1888. The decrease was most rapid in the years of famine and those immediately succeeding, but it has been continuous, and still continues. The result is, that per head of population we have more acres of land, more pounds of assessment, more cattle, sheep, pigs, and poultry, more agricultural produce, more tons of shipping, more manufactures, more deposits in banks, more capital in every shape, more pupils attending schools, more miles of road and railway, fewer paupers, fewer inferior houses. If this is not progress and prosperity, what is it? The enormous decrease in population is the most striking fact; but a stationary or even diminishing population is not necessarily an evil. The condition of the Irish people before the great famine was deplorable; population undoubtedly was excessive in this sense, that, as property was constituted—that is, under the existing system of land tenure—the produce available for the subsistence of the mass of the people was insufficient for health, comfort, or happiness. It has frequently been estimated by skilled agricultural authorities and economists that the produce of the soil of Ireland would be sufficient for the support of from ten to fifteen million people. It is an undoubted fact that the produce from the soil has always been far less than it might; even now a vast proportion of the country is capable of reclamation and permanent improvement that would make it infinitely more productive than it is. The chief agent required is labor, and the wages of labor have been for the last century lower here than in most European countries. There has always been a dearth of employment for the poor in Ireland, and there never has been a time since the days of Swift when the Irish population was not considered redundant by the official and land-owning classes; whether the population was three, eight, or five millions, emigration for the "masses" has been the universal panacea of the "classes," to whom the poverty of the peasantry has been a puzzle, a nuisance, a problem, and a crime.

The condition of the country has been and is an economic paradox. The means of subsistence are, if not abundant, sufficient; they might be largely increased by the expenditure of capital in employing labor, which is abundant and cheap: but poverty, squalor, wretchedness, and want of employment prevail. Few years pass without Government grants being made or private funds being raised for the relief of distress; yet the causes of distress are not removed, and these chronic grants serve only to confirm and develop habitual pauperism.

Dr. Grimshaw's interpretation of the official

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

figures is simple. The mass of the people were dependent on one crop: it failed, hence the famine. Ireland is almost wholly dependent on agriculture, which has ceased to be as remunerative as formerly, hence the continuous decline of the population, with the result that there is more material wealth for the residue. The explanation is insufficient: why should the peasantry have been dependent on the potato crop alone, when corn, cattle, sheep abounded, when the land was but half cultivated? Other European peasantries suffered dire distress from the potato failure, but were not swept away in millions, like the Irish. The true cause of the dire effects of the famine, of the unceasing annual decline of the Irish agricultural population, consisted in the constitution of property, in the system of large estates cultivated by tenant occupiers on the frailest tenure by which a peasantry ever lived in their native country—a tenure under which it was impossible that capital could accumulate among the people, who had therefore, in a time of sudden calamity, no resources in the shape of savings to fall back upon. No economic law operated in the distribution of wealth or land-ownership in Ireland, or in causing the disappearance of nearly half the population.

Mr. Senior, the well-known economist, and poor-law commissioner for many years in Ireland, told a Committee of the House of Commons that a smaller portion of the produce remained with the tenant in Ireland than in England or Scotland. Morally, the Irish tenant was entitled to a larger share of the produce, inasmuch as he provided all the fixed capital and equipments of his farm—house, fences, roads, drains, and so on. The rest and best of the produce—corn, butter, beef, mutton, wool, leather—was applied in paying absentee rents and charges amounting to eight million pounds sterling, in paying an excessive proportion of imperial taxation, and in maintaining an unproductive and improvident class whose existence was a necessary accompaniment of the large-estate system—the landlord himself, who in most cases rendered no services in return for his rent, agents, bailiffs, rent-warners, process servers, and a whole host of legal functionaries whose chief business was the collection of rent.

The less remunerativeness of agriculture is not so evidently the *causa causans* of the disappearance of the Irish people as Dr. Grimshaw suggests, for the decline continued in times of prosperity as well as adversity. In England Prof. Thorold Rogers tells us that his researches show that the "principal lever in the elevation of rents was the loss consequent on dispossession." Prosperity led to this elevation of rent in England, and to dispossession on a large scale in Ireland. The principal agent of depopulation in Ireland has been the power which the possession of vast estates gave to individuals. The owner could use his power either to depopulate absolutely, or to make the conditions of life such that the people fled. At the end of the last century, when land rose suddenly in value, an increase of rent on the estate of a London company in County Derry produced an almost total emigration from the district. The "clearance" system was in full swing before the famine, after which the fact of farming becoming more profitable led to the population being removed from some of the most fertile lands in the country. Alan Pollok, an Englishman, bought an estate in Galway for two and a half million dollars; it was then covered with a peasantry of small farmers; the correspondent of the London *Times* said "he made a *tabula rasa* of it by a process, not ungentle indeed, but rather painful." T. G. Adair cleared 30,000 acres in Donegal, the pretext being a murder, now believed to have been committed by one of his Scotch servants; he turned the district into a ranch. In 1873 fifty families were dispossessed off 2,000 acres of fertile land in Meath, the use of which at that time had become very remunerative. By chance I met this year, in another county, three brothers, elderly men, who had been among the dispossessed. Men of unusual energy and rare thrift, though struck down and deprived of their home and business in middle life, they had with their savings purchased other farms, and, after a painful struggle and much self-denial, again attained to moderate competence.

In these instances, which are types of what went on all over the country, it was not distress and non-payment of rent, or even excessive rents, that led to the clearances, but the power which an owner can arbitrarily exercise over vast tracts under our system of landlordism. A nobleman who used to boast he was the largest meat manufacturer in Ireland, pursued on his estate in Kildare the policy of getting rid of every small farmer near him; he was the terror of his neighbors and tenants. "There wasn't a cabbage garden but he must have it," said one of them to me lately. He took a pride in pursuing this course: "It's the only way to improve the country," I heard him say some years ago. He thus obtained the occupation of some 3,000 acres of fertile, fattening land, on which 150 families might have lived, thriven, and paid rent. In such districts there may be statistical progress—more cattle, sheep, and assessment per head; but towns and villages decay, there are roads without traffic, schools without scholars, posts without letters, tradesmen without customers, for "bullocks wear no breeches."

The population of fertile Meath has diminished 56 per cent. since 1841, and is still diminishing, while that of Mayo, where the people are more dependent on the potato, is increasing. The population of Achill Parish has increased 36 per cent. since 1851, and the assessment per head is one-twentieth of what it is in Meath. The dispeopling of Meath is distinctly due, not to any economic law, but to the power vested in the landlords of resuming occupation and use of the land almost at will. The result is an enormous decrease of people in those districts where the landlord, either from caprice or avarice, chose to oust the peasantry. The only economic tendency illustrated is that men may choose, regardless of moral considerations, to do that which will bring them the greatest money return. Population in Ireland remains most dense where cultivation in small parcels yields the greatest return in rent, and where it would not have benefited the landlord to have seized on the occupation. Lords Lucan and Sligo cleared vast tracts of land in Connaught; a farm of 30,000 acres exists on one of their estates still wearing traces of extensive eviction.

To the question whether the condition of the peasantry has improved, the answer as to some districts is that there are no peasants in them now. Yet the desolation of these districts is one factor in the result deduced from Irish statistics. In districts where the land is poor there is doubtless an overdense population. How to deal with them is one of the Irish problems. How they contrive to live is a puzzle; but as they have not only done so, but paid rent as regularly, until recent years, as the tenantry on better lands, the problem cannot be insoluble. Effects remain after their causes have apparently passed away; and one cause of the dense population in poor districts was the direct encouragement of the owners. In former days a numerous population gave political strength to the owner of the district, and spade labor produced from the poorest moorland five times the rent it would have yielded in its natural state. It was profitable to the owners to dispeople the rich lands, and such districts have been cleared; it would have been unprofitable to do so with the poorer districts, and they remain "congested." A low standard of living was begotten by the conditions in which they lived; and the independence which is the peculiar characteristic of a freeholding peasantry, has never had a chance of being developed.

The standard by which the prosperity and progress of Ireland should be gauged is found in comparison with other European countries. Such a comparison recalls a letter written in 1843 by Smith O'Brien, a landlord, and until then a Conservative, on the occasion of his joining the Repeal Association. He said, "After visiting Belgium and all the principal capitals in Germany, I return impressed with the sad conviction that there is more human misery in one county in Ireland than in all the populous cities and districts which I have visited." In each of the last six years I have visited agricultural districts of France and Switzerland, and country towns of from 10,000 to 50,000 inhabitants. One person can see but little. The observer of agricultural economy is at a disadvantage; the area is vast, the population scattered, the habits of rural life and the conditions of individuals are more varied than those of city life and of the industrial classes. But the observer may supplement his own observation by conversation with others, and extend his experience by the study of books, statistics, and laws. A traveller comparing the Irish peasantry of to-day with those of Belgium, France, or Switzerland, could not fail to come to the same conclusion as O'Brien in 1843. The appearance of the children of the poor is a good test; and the following sentence, from a report of Matthew Arnold in 1884, sums up the whole matter:

"What has been said of the general equality of conditions in Switzerland supplies an answer to the question whether there are *separate schools for dirty and neglected children*—THERE IS NO SUCH CLASS OF CHILDREN."

In the United Kingdom we are so accustomed to look on the landlord and tenant system as the natural state of society that its economic evils are never thoroughly appreciated. In Ireland it means a tax amounting to ten million sterling pounds a year paid by the peasantry, comprising 500,000 families, to a class consisting at most of 20,000 individuals and their creditors, in return for which scarcely any services whatever are rendered. The ideal landlord—a father to his tenantry, fulfilling magisterial duties, promoting education, an example in agriculture, a wise dispenser of charity—has rarely existed in Ireland. The power vested in this class over the homes, lives, and industry of the peasants has been and is a cause of continual unrest and disturbance. More than half the enormous civil-service expenditure in Ireland is incurred in maintaining and regulating this system.

Until the system of large estates and landlordism is broken up, I believe there can be neither progress nor prosperity for the peasantry in Ireland. That which is exhibited by official statistics simply means that the people have been removed or have fled, and that their homes and farms have been converted into ranches.

AN IRISHMAN.

THE MONUMENTS OF AREZZO.

AREZZO, December 1.

IF anything will teach a man how much more than two one and one make, it is the pass-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing a day alone in an Italian mediæval city, where the civic importance is diminishing and the civic vitality consequently waning. The narrow, poverty-stricken intellectual life in these spent *municipia*, once such flaming, volcanic centres of patriotic fervor, has so little in it which interests the active Western mind that it is of no use to get letters of introduction to the magnates of the city: a half-hour's conversation on the provincial characteristics will, at best, exhaust all there is in common between the American and the Italian, and then the formal politeness of the race makes a mutual torture of tedium obligatory for the rest of the stay. And so it is better to know nobody.

Thus it happens that I am here in the gray of the deepening twilight, having left Florence in the early morning and gone thoroughly through the round of interesting material—as thoroughly, at least, as one can do it alone at one visit—and seen all that calls for seeing in this cradle of great men; and as I must continue on to Rome by the morning train of to-morrow, I am absolutely stranded, what with the ebbing day and exhausted matter for examination—and hours yet to sleeping time! I had hoped to find here Gamurrini, the explorer of Falari and master of Etruscan archæology; but he is at Rome, probably, helping to arrange his findings in the new museum of Papa Giulio, and so the only Arretian with whom I could have had an hour's conversation is gone. Two people in this case can multiply indefinitely, and not merely by two, the attraction of a subject held in common.

Moreover, Arezzo is a place that has but few points of attraction on the decline of a gloomy autumn day, with a cold tramontana wind blowing after the rain, and the sunless landscape shivering off the last few sere leaves from its trees. There are some churches of interest, and especially that of the Madonna della Pieve, certainly one of the earliest and most original of Italian churches, reputed to be of the seventh century, and as free from Byzantine influence as if Ravenna had not existed; and it is perhaps as striking an instance of the barbaric state of the arts in Italy while the artists of the Eastern Empire were preparing the way for St. Mark's at Venice. This barbarism renders it the more interesting. It suggests, perhaps, Pisa, but not logically. It has a long façade with four stories of colonnade; but the motive is different, for the Pisan front is obedient to the motive of the basilica, the colonnades diminishing upwards, while the façade of the Arretian church is one immense front, a massive mask with four colonnades—the lower one having six columns, the second twelve, the third twenty-four, and the fourth thirty-two; each colonnade being terminated by the ponderous pier which, at the right, rises as a part of the campanile to the full height of the same. Most of the columns have, I think, been taken from temples or other early structures, for the variety is curiously accentuated by occasional repetitions, and the sculpture, which is evidently *ad hoc*, is of the rudest possible style. The central archway, which holds the great gate, is supported by two piers, and the inner surface of the arch bears sculptures in detached relief, which, like those over the other doors and a votive relief in the church, are of the most archaic work and evidently local. The "rule of thumb" is written on it all.

The interior is delightful—a large, simple disposition of the members, a broad nave, and two diminished aisles; on the left, four immense columns, and three on the right, besides the pier which helps carry the campanile, and which takes the place of the fourth. The capitals are ornamented with human heads, animals, and foliage—sculpture which, to me at least, gives the impression of having been done by men who had seen the work of the Byzantines, and tried to emulate it without much training. It is of a large and attractive mould. The choir is elevated about ten feet above the floor of the church, with a spacious staircase leading to it on each side, and a circular apse. The treatment throughout is admirably simple and large, and so different from most work of the region that one is led to wonder by what channels it has drifted down to us. Of course, there could have been no part of Italy which, from the time of the supremacy of the Church, has not had its artistic traditions, and, in architecture, in painting, and in mosaic, some kind of continuity; but it would be interesting to see how the Roman basilica led to this church, which is distinctly basilical in type, yet differs from all basilicas by a marked individuality.

The exterior, except the façade, has been restored with great care, and with all the fidelity to the detail of the original which is characteristic of the work done under the care of the present Ministry of Public Instruction. But the stone of which the church is constructed is a most friable sandstone, which has yielded to the elements so completely that it is difficult to find the details for restoration; and were it not for the keeping with the work of the interior, which has not suffered, one might doubt if the restorers had not worked by a moral consciousness. On the exterior of the apse there is a charming colonnade, like all the rear and flanks of the church, quite renewed; but, owing to the delightful gray of the material, there is nothing of the crudeness of the restorations of Pisa and other marble-built churches which so offends the pictorial sense of the followers of Mr. Ruskin. This is a building which the student of ecclesiastical architecture cannot neglect.

Then the Duomo, by Lapo, though still without a façade, has a great architectural interest, not only from its noble proportions, but, to me, from the suggestion in its external ornament of the Duomo of Orvieto, confirming, *pro tanto*, my attribution of the latter church to Arnolfo di Lapo (in the *Nation* of a year or more ago), while its interior is full of interest. The high altar has a magnificent screen, with the life of St. Donatus in bas-reliefs framed in Gothic ornament. Murray attributes it to Giovanni Pisano, but it is certainly earlier than his work. The tomb of Gregory X. by Margaritone is an example of the most chaste simplicity, the effigy of the Pope lying straight and stiff, with his face partially turned to the spectator, and not cut from the same block as the lid of the sarcophagus, so that it lies free, and his head is simply in contact with the marble pillow on which it lies, as a marble head must be on a marble pillow. The trefoil arch above him has at its apex a bas-relief of Christ blessing the Pope as he lies. Gregory died in Arezzo, on his way back from the proclamation of the crusade in 1276. The immense and imposing tomb of Guido Tarlati, the warrior Bishop of Arezzo, who defied the Pope and was excommunicated by him, but immortalized by his fellow-citizens, was the work of Agostino and Agnolo of Siena, and designed, Vasari says, by Giotto. Like the reliefs of the monument of Gregory, it shows how far sculpture was in advance of painting at the time it was executed.

But what I came chiefly to see was the frescoes of Spinello Aretino and Piero della Francesca, in which Arezzo was once so rich. The former decorated his native city with a profuseness which indicates that the little republic was a lover of the arts, for it was immediately after the popular revolution in 1360 that he was called into this work. He was the greatest in direct line of the artistic successors to the traditions of Giotto; for Orcagna, the greatest of all the painters between Giotto and Michael Angelo, was not in the legitimate descent from Giotto, and had qualities so entirely his own that he must be set apart from any school as completely as, at a later period, must Correggio be. Spinello was strictly orthodox, and in his art there is nothing that will not be found in some form in that of the head of his school; but in this line of succession there was no one who can be compared to him for the energy and fertility of invention with which he covered the walls assigned to him. Called to Siena, to Pisa, to Florence, and continually recalled to Arezzo, the authorities of which seem to have reluctantly allowed him to serve other cities, he covered entire walls with a power which had no equal in his day. Of all his work, we have only enough to justify his contemporary reputation. In San Domenico of Arezzo he had evidently covered the entire space offered by the almost unbroken walls of the church with his compositions; for we can still see here and there, in the waste of dreary whitewash, fragments of frescoes—a head here and a confused indication of a group there; and in one place there remains, apparently as part of a series of sacred personages, a portion of one of those architectural decorations which framed the minor subjects, in this case representing two apostles, St. James and St. Philip, standing under Gothic canopies and with, on each side, two stories from their lives, and overhead, subjects from the life of St. Catherine. But the whole is surrounded—perhaps for protection, perhaps in ignorant mutilation—by an absurd frame of relatively recent times, which cuts off a part of all the subjects, yet leaves the Apostles and their Gothic framing intact. This is extremely interesting, as showing to what an extent the character of the architecture and the mingling of sculpture with the purely architectural ornament had influenced the character of painting; for sculpture, as the elder art, had had possession of the field long enough to determine the type of decoration, just as in prehistoric archæology we find the shape of stone implements determining that of the bronze which superseded them. The pictures were introduced into a painted framing just as the sculptures had been into the architectural ornamentation of the façades of the churches, and the imitated relation was carried out in the interiors. Of this, which seems to have been a rule in the early art, even carried out in the panels and altar-pieces, there is a good example in the Boston Museum, in a picture of one of the scholars of Lorenzetti, which has its original framing complete.

It may be supposed that Spinello gave his best efforts and perhaps his best art to his native city, and these two figures are certainly of the best he has left, the composition of the draperies and the pose of the figures being very fine, and all the more interesting that they are still in the purely conventional style of Giotto, which is the legitimate development of the Byzantine motive of decoration. The intervention and use of the model, either as a person or as the material of accessories, is as yet unknown, and this is a consideration which must never be lost sight of in comparing the results of ancient and modern art, whether it be Greek sculpture or mediæval painting; for it is impossible to put in the same category the work of a man who is a mere copyist of nature, and who follows the model, or makes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a cast of the drapery he wants in his picture, and then draws or paints what he sees before him, and that of the man who has the whole repertory of his art in his mind, and works from pure invention, and consequently obtains a unity and harmony in the entire creation which the worker on the modern system can never hope to obtain, and can only imitate superficially. Italian painting, from Cimabue to Masaccio, was purely ideal in the sense that it was the reproduction of mental images unaided by the use of studio properties. It would have been probably considered as sacrilege for any man (and still more so for a woman) to pose as a saint for the use of the painter of sacred subjects, just as it was in the case of Phidias, who was condemned to death for having put his portrait in one of the sacred sculptures. It is a curious coincidence that it was not till Fra Filippo—who committed the more palpable form of sacrilege in eloping with a nun—broke over the conventions of sacred art by using individual types, that the direct use of nature appears. We have orthodox painters after him; but practically Spinello is the last great painter who had been untouched by the heresy, and preserved unbroken the sacred traditions of religious art. His importance is therefore very great in the history of art.

The frescoes of Piero in Arezzo are also very important, but except one figure, a Magdalen in the Duomo, they are not to be seen at present; the Church of San Francesco, in which is the remainder, being converted into a barrack, and not accessible to the public. There are there also some frescoes of Spinello, which are involved in the same danger and the same seclusion. W. J. Stillman.

Correspondence.

UNION WITH CANADA.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: Your remarks in to-day's *Nation* on the prematureness of Mr. Butterworth's resolutions on union with Canada lead me to express the hope that the politicians will let the question severely alone. It is not one to make capital out of, for the blindest ought to see that such action only antagonizes the object which it proposes to further. I suppose that there are few thoughtful men who do not regard the eventual extension of the Republic to the Arctic Circle as inevitable, and that there are none who desire it until it is sought by our neighbors. Until that time comes, we are better off without such addition of territory.

What renders Mr. Butterworth's action especially ill-advised is, that peaceable union with Canada will scarce be brought about in any such way as his resolutions contemplate. In all probability it will be preceded by a disintegration of the ill-assorted provinces constituting the Dominion, which are bound together by a political organization destitute of any *raison d'être* save historical accident. Self-interest will act with different attractive powers upon the different provinces, and with gradually increasing force, until first one and then another will break loose and seek incorporation with the territory to which it naturally belongs. Some years since I had an opportunity of learning something as to the popular sentiment in the Maritime Provinces, where the desire for annexation to New England seemed general. We have recently witnessed the resolute purpose of Manitoba to have free access to her natural markets to the south. Suppose the Maritime Provinces secede, and offer themselves to us, thus cutting off Quebec and Ontario from overland access to the sea; suppose their example followed by Manitoba, thus bisecting the remaining territory: what, then, is left for the isolated fragments save to make the best terms they can? Natural forces will bring all this about quite as soon as it is desirable, and meanwhile all such demonstrations as Mr. Butterworth's only aggravate the chances of rupture by irritating national pride.

Very respectfully, H. C. L.

Philadelphia, December 20, 1888.

ELECTION BRIBERY IN INDIANA.

To the Editor of The Nation:

Sir: The character of the frequent comments which I have seen concerning a recent letter in the *Nation* by my colleague, Mr. R. H. Dabney, suggests the propriety of my adding a word to this discussion of bribery in elections: First, for the reason that there are those who *cannot*, as well as those who will not, believe the testimony offered by Dr. Dabney in regard to the state of things in this locality, it would seem that a corroborative statement, together with a few more or less important additions, ought to be in a measure convincing to the former; while of the latter there are a few, perhaps many, who will be more inclined to accept the witness of one born and bred a Republican in the Wooden Nutmeg State. In the second place, I write because I conceive that the duty as well as the self-interest of all honest men and women demand an earnest and entirely impartial search for and public exposition of the truth in matters political as well as industrial, social, or religious—this, in spite of the fact that, between the marked indifference or exceptional caution of one class in the community and the bitter intolerance of others, one gets but little credit for his efforts in the interest of good government through good citizenship, be he ever so honest and earnest.

In the present instance I would say that I was with Dr. Dabney for some time on election day, saw the same disgusting and, to an American citizen holding even moderately high ideals, the rather disheartening sights that he did, and feel very much as he does in regard to the whole matter. While he was voting—in Perry township—I held a brief conversation with a "worker," who proved to be a Democrat. In reply to some questions from me, he said substantially: "No, they are gaining on us a little this morning. They have more money to spend than we have. We try to be *economical* and get votes as low as we can, but they have three dollars to our one." He seemed to think that from $3 to $5 ought to be enough—that is, he was a buyer at that rate; and our conversation was twice interrupted that he might receive reports from his assistants. This gives, however, only a partial view of the direct use of money. A goodly body, perhaps the majority, of those who can be "influenced" by pecuniary considerations are not open to offers from the other party. *If they vote*, they will vote the Republican or Democratic ticket, but they are not disposed to vote at all unless the way is made easy for them. It must be paved, so to speak, or they will not exercise this sovereign right of casting a ballot. This first came to my notice two years ago, when a student, himself an ardent Republican, remarked to me on the morning following the election that the Republicans were *awfully mad* because they had to pay two dollars each to a large group of otherwise good Republicans in order to induce them to vote. The Democrats may have had a similar experience. I am not informed.

Why not convict some of the more prominent of the guilty ones in each party? Evidence ought not to be lacking, for certainly the business was conducted in a sufficiently open and high-handed manner here on November 6. One of our most ardent politicians said early in the day that he had evidence which would beyond question convict a certain notorious manipulator of Democratic votes; but he has not as yet made any use of the evidence, so far as the public generally is informed. Given an entirely proper court, it is really very difficult to bring acceptable legal proof. Take, for instance, an illustration from my own observation. About eleven o'clock I was conversing with "worker" No. 2; this time, I knew beforehand that he was a Republican. We were standing near the polling-place when a stranger came up and inquired for Mr. —— from Richland Township (I did not recognize the name). He stated that *he had made an arrangement* with Mr. —— *concerning voting* before moving from Richland, and was now anxious to see him. In less than two minutes I saw what looked to me very much like an actual payment made him there on the square by two men who were also unknown to me. This may be good circumstantial evidence, satisfactory to the individual, but hardly reliable in court.

I may say that it is not surprising to me that men should sell their votes. For a great many people the national Government is a long way off, and the local governments only known for their taxes on property, which, of course, makes them odious in proportion as taxes seem high. The lack of interest in the one and strong dislike to the other each urge the acceptance of a new suit of clothes, a barrel of flour, or a new pair of boots in exchange for one straight vote. Moreover, the moral code cannot be expected to require so-called honest voting. Is it not as right for the individual to sell his vote as for "Statesman X" or "Statesman Y" to go to the Legislature or to Congress and make laws in the interest of this railroad or that bank or the other industry? Agitators tell of how conventions are manipulated, and there are many who cannot avoid the conclusion that if manufacturers and mine-owners and railway stock gamblers do not themselves accept the honor conferred by the popular choice, they hire their attorneys to do it for them. If we are actually governed by those most heavily interested in the game, why should the individual voter take a personal interest in the question as to which of two nearly equal contestants really wins? What does the average citizen care who nominally "represents" him? The impression once abroad, surely this philosophy must become more and more widely spread, for it is not difficult to comprehend, much as it may be out of harmony with our notions of democratic government and republican institutions. Much as we may lament its prevalence—and this by some is of course grossly exaggerated—vote-buying is the necessary outcome, the invariable accompaniment, of the extensive exercise of the right of suffrage in the presence of extreme industrial inequalities. Men not equal, either in moral or social energy or the product of both, cannot be brothers in politics; whether women could be sisters is at least doubtful.

In conclusion, I will confess that I recognize the futility, the immorality even, of exposing a public evil, a social disease, unless there is a straight road along which we can see the good, and are willing to struggle towards it. But if I read the signs of the times aright, such roads are opening before us. Politically, the suffrage question is one of the legal restraints which honest men, interested solely in good government for everybody, may be able to put upon

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trading politicians, or that these may be inclined to put upon each other. Morally, it is a question of impressing alike upon young and old, upon natives and foreigners, the duties and responsibilities of good citizenship in this democratic republic. There is much to encourage in both directions; but it seems to me that the chief source of danger (and hence it may be the most feasible point of attack) is the purse of those Pharisees, as Judge Gresham has called them, who supply the villains with the means of carrying on their nefarious traffic.

Very truly yours,

A. B. WOODFORD.

BLOOMINGTON, Indiana.

CANON TAYLOR AND THE SPREAD OF CHRISTIANITY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The *Nation* has the reputation of being willing to grant a hearing to both sides upon any question, and therefore I trust that what I have to say may find a place in your columns. In the issue of December 13 (p. 479) you say: "In the interest of those who give, and especially of those who give mistakenly, cannot a similar study to that of Canon Taylor in the October and November *Fortnightly Review* be undertaken in regard to the management, opetions, and results of the various American Missionary Societies, by some one who is interested and yet not prejudiced?" This sentence assumes that Canon Taylor's work is that of an unprejudiced observer, and is to be trusted. It is well to remember that there is a prejudice of negation as well as of affirmation. Canon Taylor made the statement that for every additional Christian in Asia and Africa there are one hundred and eighty-three additional heathen and Moslems, and that "it would take all the agencies put together [including the Catholics] sixty-four years to overtake the increase of the non-Christian people in a single year." It does not take much insight to see the fallaciousness of such reasoning. It is something like the old riddle of the dog chasing the squirrel around the tree. The squirrel always keeps ahead of the dog: how can the latter go around him? In the days of early Christianity the increase of those who were not Christians in the Roman Empire must have been fully as great if not greater proportionately than the increase of which Canon Taylor speaks; and yet Christianity conquered the Roman empire. Statistics have no value, and are very deceptive in estimating the progress of great movements, unless they are comparative. Canon Taylor overlooks the fact, also, that there must be years of preparation before the years of ingathering on the missionary fields can come. We must not forget that in Japan, at the end of five years' work, only one Japanese had been baptized; at the end of twelve years, only ten. But during the next seventeen years, down to 1886, the Christians increased more than one thousand-fold. A short chapter in the history of the American Board concerning the closing of high-schools on the mission fields, and its effect on the work, will also teach the value of civilizing agencies as instruments of Christianization.

But I do not wish to answer Canon Taylor's statements by words of my own. Two witnesses of great authority have spoken during the past year as to the value and progress of missionary work in India—one of them, Sir Charles Aitchison, late Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab, in an address at Simla, India,* in June, and the other Sir William Hunter, for twenty-five years a high official in the English service in India, in an address before the Society of Arts in London, February 24,* and also in an article in the *Nineteenth Century* of July. The former says:

"One of the most hopeful results of mission work is the lesson which is silently infusing, through native society and vernacular literature, ideas of integrity, honor, philanthropy, truth, purity, and holiness, that are distinctively Christian. In every movement for the welfare of the people, too, Christian missionaries have led the van. . . . In a thousand ways preparation is being made for the coming of the kingdom, and the blessed influences of gospel teaching and preaching are manifest to all who have eyes to see."

Sir William Hunter adds words like these:

"To a man like myself who, during a quarter of a century, has watched the missionaries actually at their work, the statistics of conversions seem to form but a small part of the evidence. . . . I know of no class of Englishmen who have done so much to awaken the Indian intellect, and at the same time to lessen the dangers of transition from the old state of things to the new. . . . The careless onlooker may have no particular convictions on the subject, and flippant persons may ridicule religious effort in India as elsewhere. But I think that few Indian administrators have passed through high office, and had to deal with the ultimate problems of British government in that country, without feeling the value of the work done by the missionaries. Such men gradually realize, as I have realized, that the missionaries do really represent the spiritual side of the new civilization and of the new life which we are introducing into India. . . . The opinion of a Viceroy like Lord Northbrook, or of a clear-headed administrator like Robert Cust, on the actual value of Indian missionary work is beyond suspicion. Such men range themselves unhesitatingly, as at the late International Conference, on the side of the missionaries."

But these men do not merely state their own observations: they also give official statistics as to the growth of Christianity in India, and these figures agree on one result. Sir William Hunter's statistics show that the Christian population of India from 1872 to 1881 increased at the rate of 30 per cent., and the total population at the rate of only 8 per cent. In the province of Bengal, which contains one-third of the population of India, "the general population increased in the nine years preceding 1881 at the rate of 10.89 per cent., the Mohammedans at the rate of 10.96 per cent., the Hindus at some undetermined rate below 13 64 per cent., the Christians of all races at the rate of 40.71 per cent., and the native Christians at the rate of 64.07 per cent." Sir Charles Aitchison sums up the whole matter when he says:

"It may surprise some who have not had an opportunity of looking into the matter to learn that Christianity is spreading four or five times as fast as the native population, and that the native Christians now number nearly a million of souls. . . . How is it that, turn where we will, north or south, east or west, in our oldest provinces or in our more recently acquired possessions, we find the Christian community spreading at a rate unknown since the apostolic times? You and I know the true explanation: it is the breath of the Spirit of the Lord. . . . The gospel message has not lost its power."

Perhaps if some one "interested and yet not prejudiced" would study deeply into the facts of the missionary work in Turkey, and especially into the facts of the work of the American missionaries throughout the world, which is spoken of in such high terms by foreign travellers, some of the facts which these eminent Indian officials have set forth might be found to be paralleled.

EDWARD S. PARSONS.

GREELEY, COLORADO.

* *Missionary Herald*, October, 1888.

* *Missionary Herald*, May, 1888.

Notes.

OUR readers already know something of the great enterprise for which Mr. B. F. Stevens of London lately asked, through Secretary Bayard, the support of Congress. Congress having adjourned without heeding either the application or its hearty endorsement by the State Department and by our learned societies, Mr. Stevens lays aside for the moment the thought of publishing his Indexes to the American historical manuscripts in the European archives (on which he says he is still vigorously engaged), and solicits subscriptions for what he calls his Transcripts. He purposes publishing facsimiles of the papers in question, carefully selected for their importance to American history, and accompanied (as we judge from a sample) by a fair copy in our modern hand with the needful description of each paper. These will be of a uniform foolscap size, and the price asked will include a box-cover for the "volume" of documents (say 500 pages to the volume). The price is $25 each, or, what is preferred, $100 for five volumes as an initial subscription, with the privilege of continuing at $20, and discontinuing whenever sated. A hundred subscribers will put the enterprise in motion; a few more will make it profitable. We can hardly doubt that the libraries and historical societies of this country will furnish that number; but we may drop a hint to men having plenty of money, that the obscurest of the small public libraries dotted over the country can, by the gift of a "volume," or for $100, be placed *pro tanto* on a par with the archives themselves as a source of original investigation by students. Mr. Stevens's address is 4 Trafalgar Square, London, W. C.

Under the title of 'Oude Kunst in Nederland,' a collection of etchings by W. Steelink, after notable paintings by the old Dutch masters in private galleries, is to be published in thirty parts (Amsterdam: T. Van Holkema; New York: F. W. Christern). The accompanying text will be furnished by J. F. Van Someren, assistant librarian in the University Library at Amsterdam. The form will be that of Arendzen's 'Moderne Kunst in Nederland.' There will be the usual variety of impressions—artist's proofs on Japanese paper, proofs before letter, etc.

The exceptional character of the past twelvemonth as regards sovereigns is shown by the portraits in the new *Almanach de Gotha* for 1889 (New York: B. Westermann & Co.). Usually four, they are now six—President Sadi-Carnot being one, the Crown Prince of Italy another, and the rest being all German—the late Emperor Frederick and his wife, and the present Emperor and Empress. But, as the editors remark, the change of President in France has caused them more trouble in recording the displacement of office-holders than the death of two Emperors across the Rhine. Otherwise, they call attention mainly to the army and navy statistics as showing the tendency of Europe at this moment. We need say nothing more of this latest issue of a time-honored authority, but our eye chances to fall on an error on p. 522, by which Senator Sherman is set down as Vice-President of the United States. This was done, of course, in virtue of his former Presidency of the Senate—a post he no longer holds; and meanwhile a new statute of Presidential succession makes Mr. Bayard, as Secretary of State, the heir-expectant.

For the third time, M. Jules Lemaitre has gathered into a volume a selection from his weekly *feuilletons* in the *Journal des Débats*; and this third series of 'Impressions de Théâ-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tre' (Paris: Lecène & Oudin; New York: F. W. Christern) is quite as interesting and quite as amusing as its predecessors. M. Lemaitre, although he has not the profound and intimate knowledge of the stage and of the principles of dramatic art which is M. Sarcey's chief characteristic, resembles the latter in having a great fondness for the theatre, and in bringing to dramatic criticism a mind at once learned and original. His 'Impressions' are very "personal," as the French say; that is, they are his own. He looks at the stage with his own eyes, and not through the opera-glass of his neighbor or the spectacles of tradition. His playful wit and his frequent satire serve only to set off his solid understanding. His analysis here of M. Georges Ohnet's "La Grande Marnière" is a masterpiece of irony; and it is not a mere repetition of the crushing discussion of M. Ohnet's popularity to be found in the first series of his 'Contemporains.' Among the best criticisms in the present volume are those on the "Œdipus" of Sophocles, the "Polyeucte" of Corneille, the "Misanthrope" of Molière, and the "Mariage de Figaro" of Beaumarchais.

A. C. McClurg & Co., Chicago, issue an interesting little volume on 'Cousin,' by Jules Simon, translated by M. B. and E. P. Anderson. It depicts with considerable force the philosophy and the man who, in 1828, electrified French audiences with the idealism of Schilling and Hegel in the reaction against the materialism of Condillac and Baron d'Holbach. There are some good reflections on Cousin's political views. For technical students the work has no value—the latter part of it especially is fragmentary and "phrasy"; but for the general reader it has merits, because Cousin, who had suffered for philosophy, is a very interesting man in a very interesting period; and Jules Simon, himself no ordinary man, has looked at his master through the medium of the present day.

The characteristic fault of 'A Brief History of Greek Philosophy,' by B. C. Burt (Boston: Ginn & Co.) is that it is too meagre for the student and unnecessary for the teacher. The author is at least half conscious of this when he apologizes for writing a mere history, by saying that the problems of philosophy are in a large measure always the same, and that Greek solutions of them have a value not possessed by others, because of their originality and freshness. This is true enough; but to imply that they are still problems makes their history much less important than their solution. The great want of philosophy at present is some earnest effort to solve these problems. Even as a text-book the work is defective, because it is almost exclusively narrative, with little or no attempt at philosophic construction or systematic interpretation.

We have neglected mention in its proper place and time of the new edition of Mrs. Helen Campbell's 'American Girl's Home Book of Work and Play'—a lineal descendant of Mrs. Lydia Maria Child's 'Girl's Own Book.' It embraces a great variety of themes, from dolls' furniture to lawn tennis, swimming, wax flowers, wood-carving, and now—by the addition of two chapters—homemade candy and broken-china tiles. The book is freely illustrated and has undoubted utility.

That rival of Niagara, the great Falls of the Snake River, is the subject, together with "other Western wonders," of 'Shoshone,' an unconventional guide-book by Edwards Roberts (Harpers). Americans are used to making plans long in advance for their summer pleasuring, and hence the present season is a good time for making a trip with Mr. Roberts on paper. Mr. Charles Francis Adams furnishes a preface by way of endorsement, and bids the tourist in search of uncivilized nature to hurry up. He points to the prophecy of a companion of Mr. Parkman's at Pike's Peak, when on "the Oregon trail" forty years ago, about the future settlement of the region, and to its overfulfilment—if we may use the word. Mr. Adams ventures on one of his own about a great hotel at Henry's Lake in Idaho, and a frequenting like that witnessed by the White Mountains or the Catskills. This little book is pleasingly illustrated. The Yellowstone Park is within its scope.

We have received a new edition, the third, of the 'New York Charities Directory'—"a descriptive catalogue and alphabetical analysis," published by the Charity Organization Society of this city.

The *Andover Review* announces, among other topics for forthcoming papers in 1889, "Socialism in its Present Aspects," "Religious Instruction in Common Schools and in Colleges," and "Is the West becoming secularized?" (by the Rev. Dr. J. T. Duryea.)

Kneass's *Philadelphia Magazine for the Blind*, now in its twenty-second year, and *Music Journal for the Blind*, now in its thirteenth year, make appeal for an endowment fund to give them stability and a wider circulation. The publisher may be addressed at No. 219 Church Street, Philadelphia.

The principal paper in the *Scottish Geographical Magazine* for December is Sir Wm. W. Hunter's suggestive address on the "Historical Aspects of Indian Geography." He first draws attention to the influence of the overwhelming forces of nature upon the native of India, giving form to his mythology, shaping his history, and above all developing his gregarious instinct from his conscious inability to "stand alone against nature." From this cause sprang the "many sorts and degrees of mutual insurance, from a joint responsibility for keeping up the continuous embankments against the river, or for maintaining the common reservoir or irrigation lake, to a joint liability for the revenue or even a joint distribution of the crops." He adds that, under the protection of the British rule, the villager grows more self-reliant and less anxious about his individual risks. "One of the strongest solvents of corporate village rights in India," he remarks, "has been found to be canal water." After rapidly reviewing the sources of Indian history and the work of the various scientific surveys of the English Government, the Trigonometrical with its 3,472 stations, the Geological, Botanical, and Statistical, the results of the latter contained in 128 volumes of 60,000 printed pages, he sketches the four seats of ancient Indian civilization, in the deltas of the Ganges, the Indus and the southeastern rivers, and in the north in the upper valleys of the Ganges. In conclusion he answers the question: "Will there ever be a united India?" by saying that he does not look forward to an India which will be a single State, but "to an India firmly knit together into a great empire."

—In the history of the legal profession there can be but few cases, recorded or unrecorded, of continuous practice for sixty-seven years, or nearly the proverbial term of the life of man. Such could have been the boast of the late Samuel Edmund Sewall, who died in Boston on Thursday, having completed last month the eighty-ninth year of his age. That great ancestor of his, Judge Samuel Sewall, who died about a century and a half ago, lived to be seventy-eight, and, bequeathing the sinews of longevity and an aptitude for the law, bequeathed also, as the author of that early anti-slavery tract, 'The Selling of Joseph,' those humane and tender instincts which made the subject of this notice an indefatigable opponent of American slavery. Mr. Sewall was born in Boston November 9, 1799, graduated at Harvard College in the distinguished class of 1817—George Bancroft and Caleb Cushing being among his classmates; entered the first class at the Harvard Law School, and graduated in 1820—being at the time of his death the oldest surviving graduate of the School; and was admitted to the bar in the next year. He had been practising for ten years when William Lloyd Garrison, just released from the Baltimore jail, came to Boston and delivered a lecture "to vindicate the rights of two millions of American citizens who are now groaning in servile chains in this boasted land of liberty; and also to propose just, benevolent, and constitutional measures for their relief." Mr. Sewall, in company with his cousin and classmate, the late Samuel Joseph May, attended this unpatronized lecture, and were instantly overcome by the force of argument and the personality of the speaker, and enlisted among his life-long friends. It was in Mr. Sewall's office that the meetings were held in November, 1831, which resulted in the organization of the first society avowing its aim to be immediate emancipation. Though scruples kept him from being one of the actual twelve founders of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, he quickly became one of the board of managers, and was fully identified with the "Garrisonian abolitionists." His benefactions to the *Liberator* and its editor kept that paper alive in its first struggle for existence, and were never afterwards withheld. When in 1839 the agitation for a political anti-slavery party, subsequently known as the Liberty party, began, Mr. Sewall took a warm interest in it, notwithstanding its antagonism to some of his old associates, and he passed through all the phases of the same movement under different names, casting his vote and being voted for (as a candidate for Governor), and all the time coöperating with the abolitionists and maintaining the most friendly relations with Mr. Garrison. In the midst of the current idolatry of the Republican party, it is significant that Mr. Sewall was not too old to give his public adhesion to the cause of reform as impersonated in Mr. Cleveland, both in 1884 and in 1888.

—Mr. Sewall's legal activity was exerted for two public ends of lasting importance. He was, in company with the late Ellis Gray Loring, counsel in the famous Med case, which led to the judicial decision that slaves brought voluntarily to Massachusetts by their owners were free. The *fugitive* slave was equally the object of his gratuitous services, and no man did more than he to promote legislation intended to prevent the kidnapping of freemen and to hinder the recapture of fugitives in Massachusetts—the so-called Personal Liberty laws, which South Carolina put in the forefront of her grounds of secession in 1860. Long before this occupation was taken away from him, Mr. Sewall effectively busied himself with the amelioration of the laws affecting the rights of women (including the suffrage). The very last session of the Legislature was a witness of his efforts at improvement in this direction in a number of minor details. In 1868 he published a treatise on 'The Legal Condition of Women in Massachusetts,' which has passed through several editions. With

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all this conspicuity before the public (he was elected a State Senator in 1852), Mr. Sewall was one of the most modest and retiring of men; and those who saw his pale, intellectual face, white locks, and frail figure could not suspect the fire, elasticity, and persistency which lurked beneath. His liberality to all good causes was incessant, and it may be said that no nobler Bostonian has died within the present century. He was twice married, and leaves a widow and two daughters, with a posterity which may yet prolong the strain if not the name of Sewall.

—The provinces of Southern Italy are at present engaged in an effort to place the ancient University of Naples upon an equality, so far as material equipment goes, with its northern sisters. Founded in the first half of the thirteenth century by the Emperor Frederick II., its first professors were members of the Dominican and Franciscan orders, and a little later it numbered among them the learned Thomas Aquinas. At that time the lectures were delivered in the old Dominican Monastery, where the cell of the Angelic Doctor is still pointed out to visitors, and a marble tablet records that the famous theologian received as his salary an ounce of gold monthly. In 1780 the University was reconstituted, and is now composed of the five faculties of philosophy, law, mathemathics, natural science, and medicine, and the number of students in attendance is about four thousand. The present building was erected in 1557 as a Jesuit college, and, though large, by no means affords adequate accommodation for the present needs of the University. It is situated, too, in a narrow, gloomy street of the old city, and presents more the appearance of a prison than an institution of learning. The plan now proposed is to sell the old buildings, which are estimated to be worth eleven million lire, and to this five million lire are to be added by contributions from the southern provinces and the central Government. With this sum it is intended to erect and equip sixteen new buildings. One of these, to be known as the University Palace, will provide quarters for the rector and the offices of administration, and will also be the home of the faculties of philosophy and law; another will be shared by the library and the chemical department, while a third will contain the natural-history and medical museums, with suitable lecture halls, and others will be given up to the departments of mathematics, botany, pharmacy, etc. The new buildings will be situated on the high ground in the new quarter of the city near the present Botanic Garden, and are expected to be completed in about ten years.

—One of the most ancient works of fiction that have come down to us, if not the very oldest, is the Egyptian story known under the title of 'The Tale of the Two Brothers.' First described at length, and in part rendered into English by C. W. Goodwin in the last one of the "Cambridge Essays" for 1858, it owes its wide reputation to-day to the complete translation contributed by P. Le Page Renouf to the second volume of 'Records of the Past.' Though simple, or even childish, in conception, yet no more so than we should naturally expect of such high antiquity, this little romance at once became famous again for the insight it affords us into Egyptian life and notions at the very period of the Hebrew bondage and exodus, and for some remarkable parallelisms—in the Bible, to the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, also to the creation of Eve (or, in classical legend, to the fashioning of the fair Pandora, endowed with all the gifts of the gods); and in late Egyptian mythology, to the fable of Rhodope and her Cinderella-like slipper. Its hieratic original is called the "D'Orbiney Papyrus," from the fact of its having been acquired from Madam d' Orbiney, an English lady in whose possession it had been during many years previous, by the Trustees of the British Museum in the year 1857. Being very clearly written, and admitting of easy understanding except in a few passages, Mr. Wm. N. Groff, an American student of Egyptology in Paris under MM. Grébaut and Guieysse, has brought out an edition (Paris: E. Leroux) designed to aid *débutants* in the study of the ancient Egyptian language, styling it an "Étude." On the one side, the left-hand page, he presents a transcription of the text, and on the other, the right-hand page, he gives a translation in French interlined with references to authorities, supplementing both of these by explanatory notes and a complete vocabulary of the words occurring in the papyrus. In so doing he has placed at the service of others the text-book and the instruction he himself has enjoyed at the École des Hautes Études—a service that will be still more available to beginners in the Egyptian language with us when an English edition shall have appeared. The present work, being a compilation as Mr. Groff acknowledges, has allowed its author no opportunity for original work, and so presents no result new to its science, as was the case in his recent Memoir upon 'Jakob-el and Joseph-el, or the Tribes of Jacob and Joseph,' which, since the moment of its issue, has not ceased to provoke comment, even though it has gained for its proposal only limited acceptance.

—To the linguistic families of America which were explored at an early day belongs the Carib group, spoken in dialects almost innumerable along the northern coast of South America, and to the eastward about as far as the mouth of the Marañon. The extinct historic and the extant dialects are difficult to classify on account of their multitude and ever shifting habitats, and new dialects of this stock are being discovered even in our epoch. Many Indians speaking these dialects are distinguished from other American natives by their complexion, which approaches nearer to the color of metallic copper than that of any other Indians. The grammars and dictionaries of the earlier missionaries settled upon the coast have been long out of print, and Dr. Julius Platzmann has therefore thought it advisable to reprint them. His beautiful facsimile editions have just been sent abroad by his customary publisher, B. G. Teubner, and amount to five large octavo volumes. They are as follows: Fr. de Tauste, 'Arte, vocabulario, doctrina cristiana y catecismo de la lengua de Cumaná;' M. de Yangues, 'Principios y reglas de la lengua cumanagota, con un diccionario;' Matias Ruiz Blanco, 'Arte y tesoro de la lengua cumanagota;' Diego de Tapia, 'Confesionarios en lengua cumanagota: (1) mas lato (2) mas breve.' Each of these two fill a whole fascicle of about 220 pages, and, as will be seen from the above titles, three grammars and as many vocabularies are contained in the first three volumes. Moreover, the dictionary of Fray Blanco is arranged etymologically in such a manner as to serve as a powerful help to any linguist wishing to compose a grammar of the coast dialects in the modern scientific way. Blanco was a missionary among the Piritú Indians, and in his volume he treats of their language more especially. The manual of De Tauste was first published in Madrid in 1680, that of De Yangues in Burgos in 1683. The Chayma Indians appear to have spoken a dialect identical with that heard at Cumaná during the seventeenth century, and the large majority of the syllables within the word end in vowels, whereas many final syllables have -n, -t, -r and other consonants as their terminal sounds. Of the closely related dialects of the Carib group, the Tamanaco was formerly spoken on the banks of the Orinoco River, at the Encaramada mission, whereas the Cumanagotas lived in and around the present seaport of Cumaná, and the Chaymas on the rivers Guarapiche, Areo, and Caripe, in the province of Cumaná.

—An eclipse of the sun will exhibit the phase of total obscuration in parts of the northwestern United States on the afternoon of January 1. This important phase lasts nearly two minutes in Northern California, and, as it occurs before two o'clock, the sun is at an altitude very favorable for delicate observation. The area within which the total eclipse may be seen is nearly one hundred miles broad, northerly and southerly; and this shadow-track, as the astronomer terms it, extends easterly, at the same time veering towards the north, thus traversing parts of Nevada, Idaho, the Yellowstone Park, and Montana. Weather probabilities in this tract are not encouraging to the eclipse observer. Having regard for considerations astronomical and geographical, the best stations are in California, not far from the coast; but while there is chance of little but fogs and cloud there, further to the east the prospect is more hopeful, though by no means ideal. In the general area to the north of Sacramento, meteorological averages make cloudy skies somewhat more likely than clear ones, while in the favored region of Nevada it would seem to be about an even chance whether the eclipse can be observed or not. Many years have elapsed of late without large astronomical results from solar eclipses; and instruments and observers have thus a fine representation in the field, for the most part in California. No foreign astronomers have yet appeared, but American observatories are well represented. Chief among them is that of Harvard University, located at Willow, California, nearly two hundred miles north of San Francisco, at an elevation of about 2,000 feet above sea level. Mr. W. H. Pickering is in charge, and the variety of complex apparatus for eclipse work has probably never been equalled. Many novel devices will be brought into operation, among them a quadruplex photographic spectroscope for determining the nature and constitution of the solar atmospheres and appendages. A 13-inch photographic telescope will picture the sun's corona on a scale never before tried with success. A special 8-inch lens will be used to photograph the stellar regions about the eclipsed sun, in the hope of getting the outlying streamers of the solar corona, and of affording new light on the existence or non-existence of supposed intra-Mercurial planets. While the spectroscopes have been so arranged as to photograph the lines in every part of the spectrum of the corona, and with a completeness unsurpassed, the preparations for photometry of this mysterious object are almost equally full. With clear skies, the extended capabilities of the apparatus will in large measure make up for the rather short duration of the total phase. No telescopes whatever will be used in ocular observations.

—Most unfortunately, the bulk of the Harvard apparatus is necessarily at a single station; local cloud may thus cause nearly entire defeat. Other parties are in the field, with equipments of more or less significance. Professor Swift, the comet astronomer of Rochester, will attempt to verify his supposed discoveries of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

intra-Mercurial planets in 1878. Professor Upton of Brown University and Mr. Rotch will undertake the prosecution of important research, mainly meteorological, on much the same plans they were thwarted in executing in Russia a year or two ago. Mr. Keeler of the Lick Observatory, nearer the Pacific Coast than any of the foregoing, will employ a six-inch telescope with spectroscope attached, for investigating the diffraction theory of the sun's corona. Mr. Barnard of the same institution will photograph the corona with ample apparatus. Other members of the Observatory staff remain on Mount Hamilton, where the eclipse is not total, to observe such phenomena as may be seen there. California parties will visit the eclipse-track with apparatus of varying capability, and glean much in the way of precise record of the phenomena of lesser interest. Professor Young, eclipse observer for a score of years, will be unable to see this eclipse. Mr. Brashear of Pittsburg goes out with special means for research into Hastings's theory of the corona. The opportunity of intelligent residents along the shadow-path will not be lost to science. Operating under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences, and on a plan similar to that successfully carried out on previous eclipses, Professor Todd has prepared a series of instructions for simple observations of the eclipse, which is expected to bring in results of importance. Detailed directions are given for sketching the sun's corona in whole or in part, and for seeing the zodiacal streamers discovered by Langley and Newcomb in 1878, but never seen since, though looked for by Norman Lockyer in 1886, and regarded by him as of the first significance. Certain geometric observations of value are also included. The instructions have been amply distributed at every available point along the line of totality, from the Pacific to Manitoba; so that, while the astronomers themselves may be in part unsuccessful through clouds at individual stations, the entire area of total eclipse is not likely to be hidden from the sun completely, and everything thus be lost.

THE ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA.

THE issue of the twenty-fourth volume of the 'Encyclopædia Britannica' (Boston: Little, Brown & Co.; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons) brings to practical completion this monumental work. It may safely be said that no other publication in the English language of the present century has had enlisted in its behalf such varied and eminent talent as is enrolled among the list of contributors to the ninth edition—talent borrowed not only from the mother country, but also from France, Germany, Italy, Russia, and America; and it may be equally safe to venture the assertion that no such combination of intellectual strength will again be found until the preparation of a new edition of the same work. Sixteen years or thereabouts have now intervened since the inception of the enterprise, a period that carries us back almost to the foundation of the present German Empire, and to within seven years of the close of our own civil war. Since that time four Emperors—Napoleon III., Alexander II., William I., and Frederick the Noble—and two Kings of first-class Powers—Italy and Spain—have followed in the footsteps of their forefathers; one monarchy—Turkey—has been all but theoretically effaced from existence, while three petty kingdoms—Servia, Rumania, and Bulgaria—have been launched into the foreground of history. We mention these facts merely to point out what compass of changes may be involved in the space of only a few years, and to indicate the disadvantages which must necessarily follow such a protracted publication.

The 'Britannica,' while eminently useful, is in reality a combination of an old book and a new book, and it must be said it is more old than new. The reader who turns to the article "Africa," in the first volume, and finds there but a bare mention of Stanley's first explorations, and no mention whatever of his famous march across the "dark continent" in 1874-77, nor of the labors and researches of Oscar Lenz, Holub, and De Brazza, may reasonably ask himself if he is consulting the latest edition of a cyclopædia only just completed. He will probably be equally startled at finding, under "Botany" (vol. iv), no reference to the now classical labors of the late M. De Bary, and by the statement in "Chemistry" (vol. v) that oxygen and hydrogen have thus far resisted all attempts at condensation and liquefaction. But it is, after all, the time-honored custom of omitting the biographies of living people which gives the flavor of antiquity to the 'Britannica.' History without our contemporaries is only half-history; and it seems ludicrous, to say the least, that a work which aims at comparative completeness in presenting the intellectual activity of the world, should bar out the very men whose deeds, in one form or another, attract the greatest amount of general attention. To present history without Bismarck, Moltke, Grant, Beaconsfield, Gladstone, Kossuth, and Garibaldi, or Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall, and Spencer, or Carlyle, Tennyson, Arnold, and Hugo, is a task which lies well beyond the abilities of the editor-in-chief and his assisting corps of editors. True, it is argued that the deficiencies arising from such omissions may in a measure be made good by expanding details in the special fields of activity with which our contemporaries are associated; but this has not been done in the case of the 'Britannica.' We have already had occasion to point out, for example, that the name of Moltke does not occur a single time in either the articles "Germany" or "France," and that the name of Tyndall is similarly missed from "Heat" and "Light." Gambetta, if we mistake not, receives but a single mention in the article "Germany," and he is barely less summarily disposed of under "France." The eventful career of Jules Favre, extending over a period of half a century, is permitted only a single mention in French history, and that in connection with his participation in the Government of National Defence in 1870. The biographer of George Henry Lewes finds no word for George Eliot, who consequently drops from vision entirely; nor can recourse be had to the article "English Literature," since that production ceases with the epoch of Walter Scott. Huxley, who has for a full quarter of a century held a foremost place among the naturalists of our day, and who has probably done more to further the "new biology" than any other person, with the exception of Darwin himself, is given hardly more than passing mention in the rather elaborate article "Zoölogy"; nor do we find, either here or under "Vertebrata" (both from the pen of Prof. Ray Lankester), the name of a single American naturalist or anatomist, if we except a simple allusion to the younger Agassiz. These are serious omissions, and they limit materially the general usefulness of the work. It is to be hoped that in succeeding editions the purely personal considerations which appear to have actuated both editors and publishers in pursuing the narrow course which they have chosen, will be abandoned in favor of a more intelligent method.

The volume before us, like its predecessors, shows a goodly array of strong articles, but most of them belong to the departments of natural and physical science. Among these we may enumerate "Variation and Selection," by Prof. Geddes, "Vascular System," by Prof. M'Kendrick, "Vegetable Kingdom," by Prof. Sydney Vines, "Ventilation," by Prof. Ewing, "Veterinary Science," by George Fleming, and "Vertebrata" and "Zoölogy," by Prof. Lankester. Profs. Flower and Newton continue, as heretofore, the minor and usually admirable notices in mammalogy and ornithology. The *pièce de résistance* of the volume is the article on "Wave Theory of Light," an essentially mathematical dissertation by the present Professor of Physics in the Royal Institution of Great Britain, Lord Rayleigh, from which the reader will learn that the modern conception of light-propagation, which is so neatly and clearly delineated in school text-books, has still about it much that is vague and incomprehensible to the learned specialist. We have already referred to certain anomalies in the, on the whole, able article on Zoölogy by Prof. Lankester—the omission of the labors of many of the foremost naturalists of the age; but they will scarcely surprise those who know what importance the author attaches to his own labors, and the low estimate in which he holds the labors of those who have ventured to differ largely from him. They will be prepared for the observation that "great accuracy in work, as well as great abundance of production, has only distinguished one among all the great names of zoölogy—that of Johann Müller." Prof. Lankester dissents from the notion which traces back the ancestral forms of the true vertebrates to the tunicates, inclining rather in the direction of the nemertean worms; and he likewise opposes the contention of Dohrn and others, that metameric segmentation indicates special affinity among the different animal groups in which it is developed. The article "Vaccination," by Dr. Charles Creighton, is largely an elaborate statistical review tending to prove the negative results of inoculation, or, at any rate, intended to question the positive results that have very generally been claimed. The data presented are certainly abundant and sufficiently reliable, and if they are not held to be conclusive in determining an important question, they are yet of a character that forbids their being passed over in silence. Want of space prevents us from entering into an analysis of the figures presented, but it may be interesting to note, as bearing upon the supposed special efficacy of re-vaccination, that the statistics culled from the civil and military population of the German Empire seem clearly to indicate an increase in the death-rate more or less proportional to the amount of re-vaccination. It would be important to have these data verified, and supplemented by others coming from a possibly less partial source.

The geographical and historical articles of the volume are in the main unimportant, and the same is also largely true of the biographical notices. Altogether, the volume shows distinct traces of crowding, abbreviation, and elimination, manifestly with the desire of closing off the work. Thus, the wholly inadequate article "West Indies," with a historical survey terminating practically with the year 1660, has but two and a half pages devoted to it, or less type-material than is crowded into the article "Westmoreland." The subject of volcanoes is dismissed with a mere reference to "Geology," and we thus fail to find notice of two of the most remarkable eruptions of which we have record—those of the Sandwich Islands of 1886, and of Krakatao in 1883, the latter considered to represent the greatest paroxysm

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in nature of which history has rendered account. The White Mountains of New Hampshire are wholly wanting; nor do we find even a reference for Yorktown, Va. Less than one page is permitted to Germany's late ruler, William I.—although six pages are still considered necessary for Wellington—while the Williams of the Netherlands, apart from the dates of birth and death, are referred wholly to "Holland." And even the famous Xerxes of old, barring such history as is contained in the articles "Persia" and "Greece," is limited to three lines, although the various Artaxerxeses are allotted upwards of two pages in vol. ii. No room seems to have been considered necessary for Joseph Warren and Anthony Wayne of Revolutionary fame, and none either for Eli Whitney, the inventor of the cotton-gin, or for our distinguished anatomist, the late Jeffries Wyman.

In turning over the pages of this in many ways remarkable work, one is constrained to ask, For whom were these pages prepared? The inspection of such articles as "Wave Theory," "Mollusca," "Light," and "Geography," where frequently for entire pages the meaning of no two consecutive lines can be comprehended by the average college graduate, not to say the ordinary reader, clearly indicates that the work is intended largely for specialists, and, it might be said, for specialists in science; but, on the other hand, the character of the geographical and historical articles fails to bear out the high standard which is imposed upon the work by the scientific ones, and this is equally true of a large number of essentially trivial biographical sketches and notices of unimportant geographical localities with which the pages are interspersed. The want of even an approximately thorough revision, and the numerous deficiencies, likewise tend towards the less elevated side of the balance. The 'Britannica' is, in short, a highly valuable undigested work for scholars.

VISCOUNT STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE.

The Life of the Right Hon. Stratford Canning, Viscount Stratford de Redcliffe. By Stanley Lane-Poole. 2 vols. Longmans, Green & Co. 1888.

THE attention of competitive examiners and other persons engaged in the devising of educational torments for the rising generation ought to be directed to Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole's 'Life of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe.' It would afford an admirable criterion for testing the toughness and endurance of a student. Any one who can read through this truly formidable work without having recourse to the demoralizing practice of "skipping," may congratulate himself on an achievement hardly less laborious than the building of the Great Pyramid. The two volumes contain one thousand pages of closely printed matter; and a biography running to this inordinate length, unless of quite exceptional interest and importance, could hardly fail to become heavy and unreadable. Neither in the career nor in the character of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe was there anything to justify this excessive prolixity. The large space which at one period of his life he filled in the public eye, was due to circumstances, rather than to any intellectual eminence in the man himself.

But independently of this want of interest in his hero, Mr. Lane-Poole has added to the heaviness of his book in another way. Lord Stratford de Redcliffe was, all his life, a diplomatist. Now, the life of a diplomatist is often interesting by reason of the men and things that he has seen; it never can be interesting in virtue of what he has done. Indeed, a diplomatist can hardly be said to "do" anything at all: he ought rather to be described as a professional card-player on a great scale. The "hands" which he has to play are not of his own making—they are dealt out to him; and all that is left for him to do is the display of more or less *finesse* in the winning of "tricks." These successes affect the course of human history about as much as the dykes which children build on the seashore affect the action of the tides. The consequence is, that there is probably no reading so wearisome and unprofitable as the minutiæ of diplomatic conflicts which occurred a generation or half a century ago. The ultimate result may possibly retain some significance still; but the moves which led up to it—who won this trick, who lost that, and so on—are as devoid of interest to all sane people as the particulars of a game of whist played in the days of our great-grandfathers. Regardless of this, Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole has drawn out with laborious minuteness the details of his hero's diplomatic labors, dating from a period as far back as the beginning of the present century. Intrigues long ago forgotten—Russian, French, Turkish—are recovered, so to speak, from the dust of the ages and galvanized into a semblance of life. It is only a biographer filled with a fine enthusiasm for his subject who is capable of feeling an interest in these attenuated shadows of what were hardly more than shadows in their most vigorous period of existence. Readers generally will be content with a timid glance at these early records, and hurry on to that later period when Lord Stratford de Redcliffe had won a name for himself as "the great Elchi." It is upon the judgment formed of his acts and policy at this crisis of his career that his position in the history of Great Britain will depend. Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole desires to have him regarded as a great and far-seeing statesman. We hold an opposite opinion; and that judgment has been confirmed, rather than shaken, by the eloquent eulogy of his biographer.

Very sudden and unaccountable is the genesis and rapid development of Russophobia in England. It clearly did not exist during the Napoleonic wars, for at that time the Russian Czar Alexander was a supremely popular person in Great Britain. At the battle of Navarino, a Russian squadron actually assisted the French and British ships in the destruction of the Turkish fleet; and in 1828, when the Czar Nicholas invaded European Turkey and forced the Porte to sign the Treaty of Adrianople, although Russian policy was disliked and distrusted in England, there were no indications of that half-frenzied feeling of fear and antipathy which nowadays finds expression in the press whenever half-a-dozen Cossacks are seen moving in the direction of India. Later on, when Mehemet Ali was overrunning Syria, a Russian army, 30,000 strong, was actually encamped in the immediate neighborhood of Constantinople; and so little impression did this appalling spectacle produce upon the British mind that few Englishmen are aware that it ever occurred. Russophobia dates from the Crimean war. It was about this time that the French ceased to be regarded as "our natural enemies," and the Russians, to all seeming, entered in and took possession of the vacant space. The totally unaccountable fact is that, simultaneously with this national antipathy of Russian policy, arose the conviction that it was imperative, in the interests of Great Britain, that Constantinople should not pass into the power of Russia.

In what respect Great Britain is specially interested in the status of Constantinople is a mystery, for the explanation of which we have diligently searched the literature of Russophobia, but wholly without result. Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole is as barren, upon this point, as others whom we have consulted; but of this more presently. It was in the year 1853 that the politicians and people of Great Britain felt that they were "drifting" into a war with Russia in defence of the divine rights of the Turk. About the Turks or the Ottoman empire they knew hardly anything, and turned to Lord Stratford Canning de Redcliffe as the one man in the United Kingdom who possessed the knowledge which was lacking in every one else. His diplomatic connection with Constantinople began so far back as 1808, when he had been appointed Secretary to the Mission. In 1810, still a very young man, he had become Minister Plenipotentiary, and in that capacity had played an active part in negotiating the Treaty of Bucharest, which made peace between Russia and the Sultan in time to set free a large Russian army to act upon the flanks of the French army retreating from Moscow. In 1824 we find him once more at the head of the British Embassy at Constantinople. He was there when the battle of Navarino was fought, and all through the Russo-Turkish war of 1828-29. Three years later he was again sent on a special mission to Constantinople, to arrange the terms on which the freedom of Greece was to be conceded; and for ten years, from 1841 to 1851, he remained, with but a single break, the British Minister at the Court of the Sultan. Thus his experience of the theatre of the coming war had been great and prolonged.

He was fully alive to the evils of Ottoman rule. We find him writing in 1821 to his uncle, the celebrated George Canning: "As a matter of humanity, I wish with all my soul that the Greeks were put in possession of their whole patrimony, and that the Sultan were driven, bag and baggage, into the heart of Asia." In 1841, when he entered upon his post of Ambassador, he saw clearly that the only hope of preserving the life of the Ottoman Empire was to infuse some degree of European justice and liberality into the violent, narrow, and defective methods of Turkish administration. For ten years he labored single-handed at this impossible task. He possessed all the strength and indomitable energy of purpose which spring from the unphilosophic mind. He saw but a single face of the difficulty which he had to overcome, and was convinced that it was the whole. He extracted from the Sultan and his Ministers laws and proclamations which would have changed the face of the Ottoman Empire, given justice to the Moslems, and liberated the Christians from their disabilities—if only there had been any power to carry them into effect. In the absence of such power, they remained little more than a dead letter, and when Stratford Canning resigned his post, it was with a depressing consciousness of failure. The terror which his strong and overbearing character had inspired in the minds of the Sultan and his officials had saved many individuals from injury and oppression, but the influence was altogether personal; the Ottoman Empire had not advanced an inch in the direction of convalescence and lasting improvement. "The great game of improvement," he wrote to Lord Palmerston in April, 1851, "is altogether up for the present; and though I shall do my best to promote the adoption of several measures, it is impossible for me to conceal that the main object of my stay here is all but gone."

He had, however, hardly set foot in England

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when the growing difficulties between Russia and the Ottoman Empire occasioned a species of popular demand that he should again return to the scene of his past labors. He reached Constantinople when Prince Menshikoff was there, ostensibly to settle the rights of Russia as regards the sacred places at Jerusalem, but really to extort from the Sultan a secret treaty conferring upon the Czar a protectorate over the Christian subjects of the Ottoman Empire. He remained in Constantinople through the many months during which Great Britain was helplessly "drifting" into a costly and unnecessary war, and it is the endeavor of his biographer to show that he exerted a commanding influence all this time over the Turkish Government. To us it appears, even from Mr. Lane-Poole's narrative, that he exerted hardly any. The Turks, in fact, completely outwitted both the French and English Governments. They temporized until they perceived that France and Great Britain were so deeply committed that retreat was impossible, and then, despite the remonstrances of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, they rejected all offers of accommodation, and declared war against Russia. The Turkish Government dragged France and Great Britain at its heels. It dictated the policy of which their befooled allies had to pay the cost.

The *casus belli* was the occupation of the Principalities by a Russian army. This unquestionably was an aggression upon the Ottoman Empire which justified a declaration of war. The Turkish Pashas, however, had been much too astute to resent the action of Russia until the possibility of their being left unsupported had disappeared. The reasons which induced the Emperor Napoleon to promise his support are obvious enough. He wanted, no matter at what cost, to become a recognized member of the Royal and Imperial Society into which he had intruded himself by means of the *Coup d'État;* but it passes the wit of man to conjecture why Great Britain should have put herself into that particular galley. The Russian occupation of the Principalities was a menace to the peace and commerce of the Austrian Empire which absolutely prohibited that Power from acquiescing in its continuance; her military position, also, on the exposed flank of the Russian army, enabled her, whenever she chose, to compel the Czar to relinquish his hold, merely by the threat of putting her troops in motion. Under such circumstances, for Great Britain to step in and, at an immense cost in men and money, do the work of Austria was, as Mr. Kinglake truly says, "as though the forces of the United States were to come across the Atlantic to defend Antwerp from the French, while the English looked on, and thanked their enterprising friends for relieving them of their duty."

This, however, was only the beginning of British folly in this matter. Austria, as all the world knows, did at last set her troops in motion, and the instant result of this operation was the evacuation of the Principalities by the army of the Czar. The pretext, such as it was, on which Great Britain had agreed to assist the Turks against Russia thereupon disappeared altogether; and then it was that, without the semblance of a *casus belli*, without reason or provocation of any kind, the British Government decided, in conjunction with France and the Porte, to invade the Russian Empire. This amazing stroke of policy brought about the death of about a quarter of a million of human beings, and when the Peace of Paris was concluded, this frightful carnage was the solitary result which the Triple Alliance could put down to the credit side of their balance-sheet. They had killed that quantity of human beings; they had achieved nothing else. Now, before we are prepared to concede Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole's proposition that Lord Stratford was a great and far-seeing statesman, we should like to know the relation in which he stood to this monstrous policy. But copious and prolix as Mr. Poole is about matters of secondary or no importance, his pages are an absolute blank so far as this critical question is concerned. He does not quote a letter or a despatch of Lord Stratford which shows that the writer was aware of the absurdity of Great Britain taking upon herself the function of cat's-paw to Austria. Lord Stratford, so far as appears in these pages, saw nothing worthy of reproach in the unprovoked invasion of the Crimea, nor anticipated a bit more clearly than the most ignorant British Russophobist the difficulties of the enterprise, or the fragile character of the alliance on which its success absolutely depended. Mr. Stanley Lane-Poole would claim for him that, among the shifting and perplexed counsellors of that time, he was the one man—save and except the Emperor Nicholas—who kept a firm and unshaken grip upon "the great Eastern Question" throughout. This, we maintain, is exactly what Lord Stratford did not. He never apprehended the all-important fact that, outside of the Ottoman Empire, the two Powers inextricably entangled in this question were Austria and Russia. Not having apprehended this, he was blind also to the fact that if Great Britain took action in the matter at all, she could only do so profitably as the ally, not of the Turk, but of the Austrian. He "rejoiced," Mr. Poole tells us, at the determination to lay siege to Sebastopol, not understanding that, even if successful, the ensuing weakness of Russia was not a fresh lease of life to the Turks, but simply an advantage to Austria.

Great Britain, thus forced into a false position, has been unable from that day to this to extricate herself from it. She has been forced to continue acting as the sustaining prop of a hopelessly corrupt and decaying domination. Millions of her wealth have disappeared in the same gulf which swallowed the enormous expenditure of the Crimean War, and it was only by the skin of its teeth that the nation was preserved in 1877 from a repetition of the insanity of 1853. Finally, this persistent and causeless opposition to Russian policy in the East has driven Russia to retaliate by a menacing advance in the direction of India, to the manifest satisfaction of both Austria and Germany. The last British invasion of Afghanistan, with its still incalculable consequence, was linked, in a direct sequence of cause and effect, with the abortive invasion of the Crimea.

VILLAGE COMMUNITY AND FEUDAL MANOR.

A Hand-Book to the Land-Charters and Other Saxonic Documents. By John Earle, M.A., Professor of Anglo-Saxon in the University of Oxford, etc. Oxford: The Clarendon Press; New York: Macmillan. 1888. 8vo, pp. 519.

PROFESSOR EARLE has contributed a most valuable aid to the study of the early institutions and social condition of England in this well-chosen collection of documents. It will serve to supplement Bishop Stubbs's 'Select Charters,' having for its aim rather social and economical than political and constitutional relations; having also the advantage of an excellent commentary, a feature which Stubbs's collection lacks. The editor explains that his plan was modified and enlarged as he was engaged in his work, so that documents appear in one part which might more properly have gone into another. The largest part of the work consists of what he calls "Primary Documents," being genuine records, chiefly from Kemble's 'Codex Diplomaticus'; these occupy two hundred and seventy-seven pages. Part II., "Secondary Documents," "comprises documents which are preserved in single parchments as the primary records are, but which, unlike those, are not contemporaneous with the date assigned to the transactions, while yet, on the other hand, probably not later than the eleventh century." Of these there are one hundred and sixty pages. They are divided into fifteen groups, some being fabrications, some from special chartularies, and some from other sources. We do not find any statement of the whole number of documents, but it cannot be far from three hundred, perhaps about equally divided between Latin and Anglo-Saxon.

An introduction of one hundred and eleven pages treats first, of the forms of the charters, secondly, of social and land relations, and thirdly, of the language of the documents. The second of these divisions possesses special interest for students of social history, and must be regarded as the most important contribution to this department of English history since the publication of Mr. Seebohm's treatise in 1883. Like Mr. Seebohm, Mr. Earle has advanced the discussion by a distinct step towards the solution of the problem; possibly he has solved it, but there still remain some considerations which he does not appear to have taken fully into account.

The problem to be solved is the conversion of the free village community into the feudal manor. The accepted theory says that this was accomplished by "encroachment on the part of some overgrown ceorl." Mr. Seebohm contends that there never was a free village community at all, but that the manors existed from the first, essentially as they were in feudal times. Mr. Earle accepts the free village community, but by its side, or in connection with it, the manorial system, as "part of the first plantation"; and says that this theory ought to approve itself by "the luminous effect which new truth generally has in lighting up places that were dark." It is certainly so. Mr. Seebohm taught us to recognize the manorial feature which the accepted theory ignored, but, on the other hand, he ignored the free elements of society. Mr. Earle has developed a theory which, in its general character, seems to reconcile perfectly the two contradictory systems.

The starting-point in this theory is Mr. Kemble's words: "There can be no doubt that some kind of military organization preceded the peaceful settlement, and in many respects determined its mode and character." The people of England, like the primitive Germans, were, on their first settlement, organized in military divisions, and the territorial areas which they occupied were based upon and determined by these military divisions: the territorial hundred was simply the district occupied by the numerical hundred. "Upon this military principle," Mr. Earle goes on (p. lv), "I conceive the English settlements were originally founded, that each several settlement was under a military leader, and this military leader is the ancestor of the lord of the manor"—the *thane* of the later Anglo-Saxon period being the connecting link between the two. "The military officer, settled with a suitable provision by the side of his company, is the lord by the side of the free owners" (p. lxii). This theory commends itself as well by its simplicity as by the completeness with which it explains the evolution of the manor. But when we carry the in-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

quiry further into detail, and ask with what Anglo-Saxon class we are to identify these military leaders, the question becomes more complicated and the answer more uncertain. Mr. Earle's suggestion may be the right one; it has much in its favor, but, on the other hand, leaves some difficulties to be explained. This theory is that the *gesithas* of the early Anglo-Saxon laws, the *comites* of Tacitus, were the officers of the invading army, and that they, settling "with a suitable provision" of land by the side of their free companions, became a kind of "local police officer. In the Laws of Ine it is assumed and implied that there is in every township a gesith. This is a universal institution: the local administration of public order rests everywhere upon the gesithas" (p. lxviii).

This assertion is more positive than the evidence will warrant. The laws of Ine do not say a word about townships in connection with the gesithas, nor do they in any explicit or certain way attribute to them any police powers. One of the three passages cited (Ine 50) must certainly be omitted, as the word *inhiwan*, rendered 'community,' is in the Latin translation *familia*, and in Schmidt's Glossary, *der Familie angehörig*. The passage (23, 1) which gives the gesith a share of the fines, need not necessarily imply "a magisterial privilege," but may mean that the King shares the fines with his followers. The obligation upon the gesith (30) to pay his wergeld is most naturally explained, as not for the misdemeanor of the ceorl, but for a similar misdemeanor on his own part. This is, at any rate, the only passage which can with any probability be made to support Mr. Earle's view, and this is too obscure to be relied upon with any confidence. On the other hand, the gesithas are distinctly mentioned (Wihtred 5, Ine 50, 63, 68) as a class of dependent followers.

Again, the *comites* of Tacitus—with whom these gesithas should unquestionably be identified, as Mr. Earle, following Kemble, holds—do not appear to correspond to the officers of an army, but to the suite or personal retinue of the chief. This is not by itself a conclusive objection, as such members of a staff, as we may call them, might easily have been assigned to duty as division commanders; but there is no indication that this was the case. They lived in the household of the chief, and served in his company as horsemen, being apparently the cavalry described in the sixth chapter of the 'Germania.' But the infantry of the Germans, as is shown in this and the following chapter, was made up of family groups, and, it is natural to suppose, was commanded by the heads of these family groups. This was the German people in arms; the chief and his followers were an excrescence. We should say that Mr. Earle's military leaders, the ancestors of the lords of the manor, were more likely to be these heads of families than the personal followers of the king or chief. It may be observed, further, that this theory of the police functions of the gesith conflicts with the generally accepted doctrine of the mutual responsibility of the *maegth* or kindred, while this mutual responsibility would be naturally and easily associated with the heads of the family groups.

If there was any class of officers over the free tribesmen, other than the heads of their families, we should incline to think that it was the *eorls*, a class which Mr. Earle, like almost every recent writer, regards as "nobles," but, as we think, without sufficient reason. It is surprising how slight is the ground for this now accepted view. Mr. Earle confesses (p. lxviii): "I do not know that a clear instance of EORL in this original sense can be found after the Laws of Aethelberht, though there are many passages where it might seem so to the unwary reader." If there are no passages after the Laws of Aethelberht, there are certainly none in these laws, for they mention the eorls only twice (chapters 13 and 14), in speaking of an eorl's *tun* (town or farmstead) and *birele* (handmaid), in a connection which might quite as well mean an officer as a noble. This word is found in no laws before the tenth century (where it is admitted to have had a different meaning) except the laws of Kent. Now, the settlers of Kent were Jutes, that is, akin to the Scandinavians, and the Earls of Kent must of course have been the same as the Scandinavian Jarls, who were appointed officers, not an hereditary nobility. Indeed, a speech of Wihtred of Kent, in the 'Saxon Chronicle,' says that the King appointed his *eorlas*.

We are inclined to think, therefore, that Mr. Earle is mistaken in making the gesithas to have been township officers. Their relation to their chief makes it improbable; the laws of Ine do not clearly support it; and it is much more likely that the officers of the infantry were the heads of their own families, or, if appointed, were the eorls. Mr. Earle is himself embarrassed (p. lxxx) by the mention in the laws of Ine (ch. 51) of two classes of gesith—the one landowners, the other having no land. He understands "by the latter such gesithas as had no family estate, whether ethel or bookland, but were provided for in the common field." A much more natural interpretation is to compare them with the two classes of *vassi* mentioned in a capitulary of 825, one, *qui in nostro palatio serviunt*, the other, *qui beneficia nostra habent*.

Whether Mr. Earle is right or wrong in this particular point, it must be admitted that his theory gives a perfect explanation of the origin of the class of thanes, or country gentlemen, as derived out of these natural heads of the village communities. Not that there was any absolute uniformity in the matter. The common theory admits that there may have been manorial estates (*eorl's tuns ?*) intermixed with the free communities; and Mr. Earle admits (lxxvi) that there were, at least afterwards, lordless free communities. And it should be noted that his theory requires on the part of the head of the community a process of encroachment such as that usually ascribed to the "overgrown ceorl," by which he was converted into the lord of the manor. We must not forget, too, that we have distinct testimony to the latter process in the provisions "of Peoples' Ranks and Law" by which it is said that a ceorl might become a thane; and "of Wergelds," where it is said that he may become "of gesithcund race."

We think Mr. Earle is mistaken (p. lxiii.) in making the Court Baron "the original court of the free settlers under a president." The Court Baron had no president of its own, but was necessarily presided over by the lord of the manor or his steward. It is true that Sir Henry Maine, Professor Freeman, and Bishop Stubbs make the Court Baron to have been "the ancient gemot of the township"; but this is because they considered the free tenants of the feudal period to have been the survivors of the free proprietors of the early period, while, in fact, they seem only to have made their appearance after Domesday Book, and to have been an integral part of the feudal institution of the manor. The Court Leet, an absolutely democratic institution, and, according to Ritson and Elton, the most ancient court in the land, may probably be identified with the original assembly of the free township—the prototype of the New England town meeting. Neither can we accept Mr. Earle's distinction between *township* and *vill*. *Vill*—a mere abbreviation of *villata*—is the Latin equivalent of *township*, and is regularly so used in medieval documents.

While, however, we cannot—at least, with our present light—agree with Mr. Earle in regarding the *gesithas* as the antecedents of the lords of manors, we gladly recognize that he has put us upon the right track. He has given us the key to the problem, even if he has not himself solved it.

Delia Bacon: A Biographical Sketch. By Theodore Bacon. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. 1888.

THE task which Mr. Bacon set himself he has performed with success. No one henceforth will question—if any heretofore has questioned—that the subject of his sketch was of rare intellectual force, of absolute sincerity, of self-annihilating devotion in her work. The world henceforth, if it will speak of her, can speak of her with some knowledge of what she was and what she did. We have nothing but admiration for the clear, strong style in which Mr. Bacon has told his story: for the dignified severity with which mere prying curiosity is rebuked; for the skill with which that is presented which ought to be presented; and for the judgment that has directed the omission of what is omitted. There has been, of course, nothing set down in malice, nor has anything been extenuated. The life is laid before us as it was lived; there is but little comment upon it, and the letters speak for themselves.

Yet, with all respect for the pious motives of Miss Bacon's nephew, we question the desirability of this publication. The story is too painful. It is a tragedy without a lesson, a history without a moral. A harsh fate shrouded Miss Bacon's earlier years in the direst poverty, and when her brilliant genius and arduous industry had beaten back this sordid foe, her own fatal perversity exposed her again to its cruel and successful assaults. It is not only charitable, but reasonable, to suppose that she was insane from the time when she first conceived the plan of tearing the laurel from Shakspere's brow; but why should we follow the progress of her delusion and witness its deplorable results? Still, we are bound to say that Mr. Bacon touches these sad details with so gentle a hand as to come well within the limits of the Horatian interdict.

There is one gleam of light upon these dark pages—the almost superhuman goodness displayed by Hawthorne towards a woman sorely smitten by fortune, and yet rendered incapable by her delusion of appreciating what was done for her. We take no account of the attentions of friends and the devotion of relatives; but Hawthorne was a stranger, burdened with family cares, and with heavy drafts upon his income as well as his time. Nevertheless, he responded instantly to Miss Bacon's appeal, reading her manuscript with sympathetic care, giving her the benefit of his literary judgment, relieving her pecuniary distress, and even, it is presumed, supplying the funds without which the publication of the book into which her life had gone would have been impossible. The ingratitude and reproach which rewarded his interest nowise affected the generous flow of his benevolence; and the tenderness and consideration which mark his letters, after as well as before Miss Bacon had spurned his assistance, are incomparable. We have not space to quote from what he has written of her; those

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

who do not see this book will find an epitome of her story in 'Our Old Home.'

Nor have we space for more than the briefest extracts from Mr. Bacon's account of her "revelation." It does not appear that her family name stimulated her interest in the problem; the suggestion came rather from the literary studies in which she had been for many years engaged:

"Revelation, discovery, or fancy, however—whatever it was, an utterly subordinate part of it all, though an essential part, was that which concerned merely the authorship of the plays. . . . Finding in them a higher philosophy even than in the 'Advancement of Learning,' a broader statesmanship, a profounder jurisprudence, and, above all, a bolder courage than in all the avowed writings of the great Chancellor, she only obeyed the teachings of that inductive system which he had expounded in seeking an adequate authorship for so magnificent a creation. . . . If the plays were really such a system of philosophic teaching, not only was it difficult to accept the competency for it of the Stratford poacher and London horse-boy: it was hardly less trying to credulity to impute so vast an enterprise, added to all the gigantic intellectual labors which he avowed, even to the greatest Englishman of his age. She judged, therefore, that as there had been collaboration before and since in literary work, so here the most brilliant and philosophic minds of the Elizabethan court coöperated in the work which was too great for one, and consented together, for their common safety, to the imputation of their united work to the theatre manager who brought out the plays, and whose property they were because they had been given to him. . . . It is scant justice to her memory to say that . . . she never devoted herself to whims or fancies about capital letters, or irregular pagination, or acrostics, or anagrams, as concealing yet expressing the great philosophy which the plays inclosed."

No one can read the noted article in *Putnam's Magazine* in which Miss Bacon first made known her views, without somewhat yielding to the persuasiveness of her argument, or without feeling the greatest admiration for the brilliancy of her style. It is a masterpiece of irony, and as such deserves a permanent place in our literature. If it is true, as so clear-headed a man and so sagacious a critic as Hawthorne declared, that Miss Bacon's book could have been shaped into a "volume full of eloquence and ingenious dissertation—criticisms which quite take the color and pungency out of other people's critical remarks on Shakspere"; that "this bewildered enthusiast had recognized a depth in the man whom she decried which scholars, critics, and learned societies, devoted to the elucidation of his unrivalled scenes, had never imagined to exist there"; that "she had paid him the loftiest honor that all these ages of renown have been able to accumulate upon his memory"—if this be true, would not the most decorous monument to Miss Bacon have been such a volume as Hawthorne describes?

Modern Methuselahs. By John Burn Bailey. London: Chapman & Hall. 1888.

This is not a practical book. Mr. Bailey discloses no rule for the attainment of a centenary of years, unless such a rule may be deduced from the generalization that most persons who have approximated to that age have been below the average height. But he does not make it clear that this may not have been due to shrinkage, and, moreover, there is very high authority for the futility of attempting to regulate our stature by taking thought about it. So far as precept is concerned, therefore, Mr. Bailey does not have much to offer us, while some of his examples can only be described as pernicious and demoralizing to the last degree. What but evil can result to our young men from reading of William Riddell, who died when one hundred and sixteen, having had "a remarkable love of brandy, of which he drank largely, but he carefully avoided water; for two years before his death he subsisted on bread soaked in spirits and ale"? Even more shocking is the record of the one hundred and four misspent years of Mr. Thomas Whittington, who "actually never took any other liquids, as liquids, into his stomach than ardent spirit—London gin; of which compound, until within a fortnight of his death, he took from a pint to a pint and a half daily." And who can be advised to emulate the woman who preserved her faculties for fifteen years over a century upon a diet of buttermilk and greens, or that other centenarian who attained like results by restricting herself to potatoes?

In other respects the record of the personal habits of some of these worthies is equally unedifying. Mrs. Lewson is said to have reached the age of one hundred and six years without having washed herself, satisfying the requirements of neatness and conventionality by smearing her face and neck daily with lard, while she touched up her cheeks with rose-pink. She entertained the opinion that people who washed themselves always caught cold. These aged persons seem to have been invariably married—some of them, in the language of Artemus Ward, very much so, as, John Weeks, who took his tenth wife when he had attained the age of one hundred and six. Perhaps John Rovin was more fortunate, as his wife was spared to celebrate with him their one hundred and forty-eighth wedding anniversary. Of the celebrated Thomas Parr, who is reputed to have attained the ripe age of one hundred and fifty-two years, nine months, and some days, we blush for humanity in recording that during the lifetime of his first wife, and after he had turned his hundredth year, he was compelled to do penance in Alberbury Church for a violation of his marital vows.

In justice to humanity, however, we must declare, in the words of Mr. Thomas Bailey, the author of 'Records of Longevity,' that "many of these alleged facts are deficient in that strict verification which would enable a man to speak positively as to the truth of the statements." It is perhaps not speaking too positively to say that there is no satisfactory evidence that any human being has ever lived much more than a hundred and five years. The records of the life-insurance companies of London show only one case of a centenarian policy-holder, and they deal only with selected lives. The late Mr. Thoms, editor of *Notes and Queries*, devoted himself to the investigation of a number of these cases of reputed longevity, and found them, with few exceptions, fabulous. It has been maintained by men of science that the natural term of life for every animal is five times the period needed for the full development of the skeleton, a period in the case of man of about twenty-one years. Prof. Owen calculated the term of human life upon this basis at one hundred and three years and a few months, and it is not very probable that this term has been often exceeded. Placidity and regularity of life perhaps help men towards this limit as much as anything; as Dickens says: "Father Time, though he tarries for none, often lays his hands lightly on those who have used him well."

Mr. Bailey's book does not purport to be the result of original investigation, and is of little value to those who take a scientific interest in its subject. So far as he has followed in the footsteps of those who have made a careful study of the records of "long-lasting," and tested them by collateral evidence, he has made an agreeable compilation, and he adds some contributions of his own; but, by an extraordinary freak, he has devoted the larger part of his work to the biographies of a number of more or less distinguished people who lived to be ninety-five years old, but who have absolutely no other claim to be mentioned between the same covers. They range from St. Anthony and Johannes Cantacuzenus, Emperor of the Eastern Empire, to Titian, Mrs. Garrick, Miss Herschel, and Sir Moses Montefiore. In most of these cases it is obviously impossible to assign any cause for longevity; and why Mr. Bailey should care to condense such works as Cavalcaselle's 'Life of Titian,' giving critical estimates of his work as an artist, etc., and pad this volume with the results, we are unable to conceive. He has very nearly spoiled what might have been a useful and entertaining little monograph.

Essays in Criticism. Second Series. By Matthew Arnold. Macmillan & Co. 1888.

In this series of essays Mr. Arnold goes over some very old ground and pronounces some new judgments. The first essay, on the study of poetry, shows that whatever he may have said elsewhere on the subject of "seeing the thing as it is," and in disparagement of abstract standards of criticism, he was always at the core a literary realist—if one more use for this much-abused term may be pardoned. That is, in poetry he believed in permanent, real tests of excellence, apart from questions of fashion or character or local taste. There are two fallacies with regard to poetry, he says, against which we must guard—one the historic fallacy, the other the personal fallacy. By the first he means the tendency to exaggerate the importance of a poet's work on account of the importance of his historic position in the development of poetry—the common fallacy of scholars and specialists; by the other, the tendency to dwell on the personal impression produced by the poet upon ourselves. Mr. Arnold believes that there is a certain classical quality of wisdom and sober earnestness in the very best poetry, moreover, which differentiates it from all inferior poetry; and he holds that this quality may be detected in single lines and even phrases of great masters, such as Dante and Shakspere.

In the main, does not the English or American reader sympathize with the view here expressed? Does he not feel a resentment against those who would maintain that all literature is a matter of impressions, taste, and times? Does he not always in his secret soul adhere to the conviction that the great masters of poetry have had visions of the Real, the True, the essence of things as distinguished from their appearances? It is interesting to find in this latest expression of Mr. Arnold's opinions something which not remotely resembles the view of poetry taken by another great critic of our time, himself also a poet—Mr. Lowell. Mr. Lowell has always maintained the mystic power of poetry to detect and reveal the hidden meaning of things—a view opposed to the skeptical attitude of most modern criticism, and which a critic of the school of Taine would probably explain as being a result of the peculiar characteristics of the earnest and at the same time imaginative race to which both Mr. Lowell and Mr. Arnold belong. And so no doubt it is, and so also (would Mr. Lowell and Mr. Arnold reply) is the incapacity of the most gifted critic of the French school to perceive the true glory of English poetry, a result of the peculiar characteristics of the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

skeptical and rationalistic race which produced a Voltaire, but could not produce a Shakspere. Probably the difference can never be settled, for even the arbitration of a third system of criticism would be unsatisfactory to both sides; and we can do no more than note in passing that Mr. Arnold is not to be regarded as a renegade from the old English view.

As a realist, he gives the reader a much needed warning against allowing himself to be carried away by the *personal* test; but here the essay, it seems to us, might have been made stronger. It is not merely the personal relation of the poet to ourselves, but our interest in the character of the poet, that tends to confuse the judgment. The fondness for confusing and debasing literary tests by considerations of a purely personal character is, and we may add probably has always been, one of the marked difficulties in the way of obtaining real judgments of value. Compare the fortunes of Byron and Shakspere. Of Byron we know almost everything that is to be known, and we never think of his poetry now without thinking at the same time of his character. Of Shakspere we know little or nothing, and our feeling about his plays is influenced in the very smallest degree by our estimate of his character. But blot out what we know of Byron's life, imagine the name to be a great shade hovering over his works, like that of Homer over the 'Iliad,' or Shakspere over the Sonnets, forget his cynicism, his immorality, and his unfortunate married life, and then read "Childe Harold," and make up your mind as to what in real essence it is—a great poem or the work of a charlatan. This is practically what time in the long run effects. It makes personal considerations indifferent, and enables us to distinguish, after hundreds of years, perhaps, what is classical from what is impermanent and hollow. Perhaps it is impossible for anything short of the lapse of time to accomplish it; perhaps the real fact is, that criticism is always personal during the lifetime of the poet and for a long time afterwards, that then comes the period of real criticism, when character counts for little and the work for everything. But if criticism were what it ought to be, we should surely be better able than we are to discriminate; and Mr. Arnold, with his clear insight, almost persuades us that under his guidance we may learn to pick out what is "classical" in poetry, as an expert in a different line will unerringly pick out the real coin from the counterfeit.

The volume contains a number of essays previously published, but not generally known, on Byron, Keats, Milton, Wordsworth, and, in a wholly different field, Tolstoi and Amiel. Those on English subjects are more or less pervaded by the same central idea—that of distinguishing between the classical and the non-classical, between the true and the false, between the soberly serious and the frivolous or superficial. Here Mr. Arnold is a sure guide. Making all due allowances for his hortatory tendency to iteration, there has been no such keen insight, no such delicate and true taste, no such mastery of style in our day. Perhaps he is better when he is severe than when he is lenient, but then we must remember that he is always a preacher. As a specimen of analysis, we should like to quote from the essay on Byron; but after reading and rereading it, we find that no detached paragraph gives any fair idea of the whole. And this is true of most of Mr. Arnold's writing. Isolated passages are false, because they so often bring out his peculiarities without giving a true idea of his strength. To the mass of readers he has been too much already known by catchwords, "sweetness and light," "Philistinism," etc., etc.; but to his real admirers it is not such matters as these that constitute his interest. It is as a poet, as a master of a prose style unmatched for beauty, delicacy, force, and point, and finally as perhaps the greatest critic of a critical generation, that he has left a deep and lasting mark on our literature.

Around the World on a Bicycle. Vol. II.—From Teheran to Yokohama. By Thomas Stevens. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888.

Mr. Thomas Stevens is a wholesome and sturdy young fellow, whose hand we are proud to have shaken as we encountered him once at a meeting of wheelmen. His achievement is an extraordinary feat of perseverance and pluck, and the book in which he records it is a nonchalant, unaffected account of interesting adventures. We have already paid our respects to his first volume. We have the same good opinion of his second volume, which appears now after an interval of more than a year. In fact, the second part of the record contains even more to enchain the reader than the first part. The incidents related take place in lands less known to us, and filled with wilder men; while the cyclist's courage and adroitness are even more marked than in his earlier journey. The great fault of the book is that it is twice too large. Even the most enthusiastic cyclist will not care to mark every turn of Stevens's wheel during the 13,500 miles of its rolling from San Francisco eastward to Yokohama; yet it is almost this that the reader is called upon to do. One cannot contemplate such a panorama of gyration without feeling his head swim uncomfortably.

After spending the winter in Teheran, Stevens pushed northeastward in the spring of 1886, hoping to cross the Siberian frontier, and, after reaching the valley of the Amoor, pass that way to the Pacific. He travelled hundreds of miles only to have permission refused him at last by the Russian officials, whereupon, turning southward, he forced his way through Afghanistan to Herat, with the idea of proceeding thence into northwestern India. Here, too, his path was blocked, leaving him no recourse but to turn back from the heart of Asia, which he had so fully pierced, to the Mediterranean, and proceed ingloriously by steamer to Kurrachee. Thence ascending the Indus, he conscientiously mounted his bicycle at the nearest possible point to the Afghan fastness he had before succeeded in reaching, and spun by Lahore, Delhi, Agra, and Benares, through the whole breadth of Hindostan to Calcutta. Another sea voyage carried him by way of Singapore to Hong Kong, where, taking his life in his hand, he dashed into China, penetrating to a tributary of the Yang-tse-Kiang. Here, after other hairbreadth escapes, he was rescued from the murderous rabble of an interior town by good-natured officials, who, out of mercy to him, sent him under guard to Shanghai. Reaching the southern border of Japan, he traversed that land from south to north through a friendly population, and reached San Francisco at last from Yokohama, by the *City of Pekin*, rather more than two years and a half from the time of setting out.

If it had been done for some great cause, Stevens would be a hero worthy of an epic. Since it came about only from a spirit of adventure, no more can be said than that he was marvellously dexterous and cool. How often his neck was in danger it would not be easy to say. The peril is of various kinds—headers from his machine in pathless wildernesses, the fingers of stranglers who have him at their mercy, the swords of barbarians angry at his intrusion into their dens. The record, however, is by no means entirely of hardship and risk. He rides through many a lovely landscape, and often sees a pleasant side of human nature; as, for instance, in the picturesque Afghan nomads who fling the backsheesh he offers them contemptuously on the ground, in hospitable Orientals who entertain him with tea and tom-toms, and in expatriated Europeans glad to welcome a white face. Here is a good touch of humor from page 243:

"Among other distinguishing qualities, Mr. M. shines in Teheran society as the only Briton with sufficient courage to wear a chimney-pot hat. Although the writer has seen the stove-pipe of the unsuspecting tenderfoot from the Eastern States made short work of in a far Western town, and the occurrence seemed to be scarcely out of place there, I little expected to find popular sentiment running in the same warlike groove, and asserting itself in the same destructive manner, in the little English community at Teheran. Such, however, is the grim fact; and I have ventured to think that after this there is no disputing the common destiny of us Anglo-Saxons, whatever clime, country, or government may at present claim us as its own. Having seen this unfortunate headgear of our venerable and venerated forefathers shot as full of holes as a colander in the West, I come to the East only to find it subjected to similar indignities here. . . . More than our common language, methinks; more than common customs and traditions; more than all those characteristic traits that distinguish us in common, and at the same time also distinguish us from all other peoples—more than anything else does this mutual spirit of destructiveness, called into play by the sight of a stove-pipe hat, prove the existence of a strong, resistless undercurrent of sympathy that is carrying the most distant outposts of Anglo-Saxony merrily down the stream of time together, to some particular end; perchance a glorious end, perchance an ignominious end, but certainly to an end that will not wear a stove-pipe hat."

Here is a scene upon a Chinese river, page 388:

"Anon there come along men, poling with surprising swiftness slender-built craft on which are perched several solemn and important-looking cormorants. These are the celebrated cormorant fishers of the Chinese rivers. Their craft is simply three or four stems of the giant bamboo turned up at the forward end; on this the naked fisherman stands, and propels himself by means of a slender pole. His stock-in-trade consists of from four to eight cormorants, that balance themselves and smooth their wet wings as the lightsome raft speeds along at the rate of six miles an hour from one fishing-ground to another. Arriving at some likely spot, the eager aspirant for finny prizes rests on his oars and allows his aquatic confederates to take to the water in search of their natural prey, the fishes. A ring around the cormorants' necks prevents them swallowing their captives, and previous training teaches them to balance themselves on the propelling pole that the watchful fisherman inserts beneath them the moment they rise to the surface with a fish; captive and captor are then lifted aboard the raft, the cormorant robbed of his prey and hustled quickly off again to business."

With a touch now of humor, now of pathos, and an unlimited amount of picturesque description, the story, though over-long, is seldom dull, and is to be heartily commended as certain to afford much incentive to manliness in the youth by whom it is sure to be read.

Names and Places: Studies in Geographical and Topographical Nomenclature. By J. D. Whitney. Cambridge, 1888. 8vo, pp. 239.

This is such a satisfactory and admirable little book that it is to be regretted that the author has limited the edition to a hundred copies; but, whatever the size of the edition, there is little doubt that the contents will, through the compilers, speedily find their way beyond its pages. The geographical studies include only

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"Appalachian and Cordilleran" and "Oregon and Pend' Oreilles." The topographical section is divided into four parts: (1.) Introductory; (2.) Mountains, Peaks, and Sierras; (3.) Valleys, Gorges, and Cañons; and (4.) Plains, Prairies, and Savannas. A couple of the letters of the index, of average comprehensiveness, will best illustrate the range of topics. Under M are Marsh, Meal, Mesa, Meseta, Montaña, Montañuelo, Monte, Monument, Moor, Morass, Moss, Mound, Mount, and Mountain; under T appear Table, Table-land, Table-mountain, Talus, Terrace, Teton, Todi, Tooth, Tor, Tower, Tundra, Tuque, and Tuquet.

The term Appalachian is derived from Appalache, applied by De Soto, 1538-43, to the southern end of the chain, the northern extremity of which was discovered by Cartier in 1535. The name has various forms, as Palassi, Apalchen, and Apalatcy, in different writings, and was no doubt the aboriginal name of a locality, or of a tribe of Indians of the neighborhood. To the conclusions of the author confirmation may be added from Rochefort, 1658, with another form of the name: "L'État des Apalachites contient six Provinces, trois déquelles sont en cette belle et spacieuse vallée qui est entourée des montagnes d'*Apalates*, au pied déquelles ces peuples habitent" (p. 354). Appalachian is now applied to the entire system, while Alleghany, preferred by some geographers, designates but a portion of it.

Cordilleras and Cordilleran were chosen by Prof. Whitney, 1868, for the complex of ranges west of the Mississippi basin, Andes and Andean being by common consent restricted to the western system of South America. This seems to have met with favor on all hands, though the Spanish word "cordillera," a mountain range, is of very general application. The name "Rocky," from Arrowsmith's map, 1802, and "Sierra Nevada," from Verrazzano's chart, 1582, are fixed respectively upon the eastern and the western portions of the Cordilleran system.

The chapter on "Oregon and Pend' Oreilles" may commend itself rather more to others than to Oregonians. The latter, however, will find it difficult to subvert the argument. Lieut. Symons, in his report on the Columbia, suggested that the origin of the word "Oregon" might have been in the Spanish *oreja*, the ear, or a derivative. Our author goes farther, and proves the original to have been *orejon*, big ear. To do so, he first establishes the presence of the Spaniards in the region, by means of the testimony of the early French explorers, of Lewis and Clarke, and others. In this the use and abundance of horses play an important part. The next step is to show the existence of a tribe of Indians in the region to which the Spaniards would apply the name Orejones, big ears. The "ear-bobs" of the English and the "Pend'Oreilles" of the French supply what is needed here. Certain Indians of South America, who enlarge the ear by ornaments, are at present called Oregons by the English or Orejones by the Spaniards. Commenting on the paper by J. H. Trumbull, who states that the name is not Spanish, the Professor claims to have answered every argument advanced. As he puts it, he has shown that the name *was* recognized on the Columbia as of Spanish origin; the Spaniards *did* inhabit the region; there *is* a tribe of Indians dwelling on one of the main branches of the river to which the name is peculiarly appropriate; the word "Orejon" *would* naturally be written "Oregon" in English, as at the present time, by persons writing about South American Indians; and the *g* more nearly renders the sound of the Spanish *j*, for instance, Vallego for Vallejo.

To give the results in this way conveys no idea of the excellence of the style or of the amount of information in the author's discussions of usages, causes, and conditions in the different localities. An example will better illustrate the treatment of topographical names.

"*Marsh* is a word in common use in both England and the United States, with a meaning not essentially different from that of 'swamp.' Skeat defines it as 'morass, swamp, fen,' and says that it has the form in middle English of 'mersche,' and in Anglo-Saxon of 'mersc,' which latter is a contraction of 'merisc,' originally an adjective signifying 'full of meres or pools.' As used in the United States, the word 'marsh,' often pronounced 'ma'sh,' is heard much more frequently along the seacoast in New England than it is in the interior and farther south. The low lands along the New England coast liable to overflow by the tide are always called 'salt-marshes.' The same word 'marsh' is one commonly used in Northern Germany in almost exactly the same way in which it is used in this country. The 'Marschländer' (called also simply the 'Marsch') form an important topographical feature along the coasts of the Baltic and North Seas, and especially in the vicinity of the Elbe. They are uniformly level, the monotony of the surface being hardly broken by the dikes by which they are traversed at regular intervals, and the ditches which accompany them. On the dikes grow magnificent trees, the soil is very fertile, the cattle superb, and farming highly successful. The contrast between these marsh lands and the region of sand and gravel —the 'heath' and 'moorland'—which lies adjacent to them on the south is most striking."

Within the limits indicated by the headings of the chapters the omissions are very few. A prominent case which occurs to us is that of the word "slough," in common use westward, instead of marsh or swamp. For example, in a late number of *Shooting and Fishing* (a Boston periodical), there is a notice of the "excellent duck and goose shooting the slough ponds and lakes afford." Naturally under the name "Hole" there is no mention of the recently coined "Holl" (in "Wood's Holl"), the *o* in which is asserted by ironical mariners to have been originally an *e*. Among the more than three hundred names in the work that have become generalized and applicable to class or form of scenic feature, there is not one of Indian origin. Our names of this character are nearly all derived from three languages, the English, the French, and the Spanish. The scholarship required to trace the evolution of the terms, as is done in the studies before us, is not by any means to be measured by a knowledge of these three. The thoroughness with which literature has been ransacked by the author is evidenced by abundant quotation and reference, largely poetical, from the early writers. The reader who is led by its title to expect dryness and lack of interest in this book will be most agreeably disappointed.

The Soul of the Far East. By Percival Lowell. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.

Mr. Lowell entitles his study of the social life, language, art, religion, and general characteristics of the Chinese, Coreans, and Japanese, 'The Soul of the Far East.' This is on the principle of *lucus a non lucendo*, for, on approaching his subject, he found that the mind of the Eastern Asiatic is almost entirely destitute of that principle of individualization which is so marked a trait in the Western man. To the Chinese and their pupils in civilization, the Coreans and Japanese, he denies all mental initiative. They are copyists who cannot originate anything. The stimulus of individuality being absent, so also is the principle of progress. The individual is nothing, and the community is itself the unit. The youth who is born and reared amid the numbing impersonality of the Far East is never truly "born again" into that self-consciousness which marks the second entrance into life of the Occidental. The degree in which the various races of men have felt the force of this birth of mind not only differs vastly, but it registers its effects in facts, fancies, faiths, and indeed in all those outward shadows of the mind which make up civilization; or, to put it in Mr. Lowell's own words, as the thesis which he would prove by a study of the Chinese and their pupils: "The degree of individualization of a people is the self-recorded measure of its place in the great march of mind" (p. 195).

With a literary skill and facility and copiousness of choice language equal to his thorough analytical power, Mr. Lowell gives first the results of the examination of the Far-Eastern family and the institution of adoption. He then puts their language, art, and religion under dissection, only to find these expressions of thought strikingly deficient in the elements of personality. His are not the resources of a scholar familiar with the vernaculars or literatures of the nations who still use ideographs, and some of his statements, meant to be expressions of facts, may be challenged; yet these trifling defects do not invalidate the general force of his conclusions. He is careful to quote as authorities only those whose names carry their own guarantee of accuracy. As at least one very large side of truth, his little book is an original and fascinating contribution to our knowledge of the extreme Orient. The rising young men of Japan should read, learn, mark, and inwardly digest its contents, and reveal to us, if they can, the other side of the shield. It seems very certain that if Newtons and Shakesperes are to be grown on the soil of Japan and China, the inhabitants must change their course of thought. For lack of vision, they are in danger of perishing before the onset of the self-asserting individuals who make up the nations of the West. Building better than he knew, Mr. Lowell has either innocently, or covertly with a purpose, slipped into the hands of the scientific and religious missionary a most powerful argument and warrant. Not only should the Mission Boards furnish a copy to their clerical emissaries, but the governments of China and Corea, not to say of Japan, might well recommend its study as a text-book.

The volume is a reprint of the author's papers contributed to the *Atlantic Monthly*, and is exquisitely bound in white, with modest Japanese symbols on the cover, the typography being of that elegant and satisfying sort with which the Riverside Press has made us long familiar.

The Boyhood of Christ. By Lew Wallace, author of 'Ben Hur' and 'The Fair God.' Harper & Bros. 1889.

If magnificence of type and paper could atone for lack of matter in a book, it would do so here. Some of the wood-engravings, also, are excellent in their design and execution. Those which reproduce well-known old or modern pictures are easily the best; some of the others are extremely weak. That the child in these illustrations always has the halo must be a grief to Gen. Wallace, who has a theory that this was a development of his maturer years. Gen. Wallace cannot be congratulated on the success of his performance. From beginning to end he has written in the most stilted manner. His dedication and his preface do not escape the general inflation. The setting of the story is absurd. Uncle Midas, whose name indicates the luxurious character of his surroundings, gives a Christmas-eve party to his young friends.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Puss and Nan leave the dancing, and, penetrating his study, where he sits magnificent as the good Haroun al-Rashid, beg him for a story, and give him a subject, "The Boyhood of Christ." Strauss's waltz music cannot beguile them when once the story has begun. Other young people come to drag them off, but stay to listen, until only the fiddlers are left — but no, they have followed the rest. Gen. Wallace has also kindly indicated the interest of his narration by a running fire of exclamations of delight from his young friends. And what is the story that could delight so much and make a youthful company indifferent to Strauss's music? It is not, as many will anticipate, an attempt to conceive the life of a little Jew of Galilee in the time of Jesus. It is mainly a rehash of the Apocryphal Gospel of the Infancy. The senseless stories of that book are told at first in Gen. Wallace's own gaudy style. It is a great relief when Uncle Midas takes the book and reads.

The lecture upon Snakes in Iceland was prophetic of Gen. Wallace's 'Boyhood of Christ.' He comes to the conclusion that Christ had no boyhood to speak of, only a "marginal time in which to taste something of natural boyish freedom." For one thing, "his precocity was miraculous. At a time when other children are muling in their mother's arms, the cells of his understanding began to enlarge and fill with knowledge." He does not think Christ was reared in poverty. "It is to be remembered that among the gifts of the Magi there was gold, and I please myself thinking there was enough of it to support the holy family while it was in Egypt and afterwards in Nazareth." "As to the social position of the family, it is enough to remark that, besides being a just man, Joseph was a lineal descendant of David the King." It is evident that Gen. Wallace is troubled by no critical considerations. He passes by, as idle wind which he respects not, the fact that, between David and Jesus, Luke has fourteen more generations than Matthew, and that the lines of descent are different. Gen. Wallace does not, however, feel obliged to accept all the statements of the New Testament. That says "Mary kept all these things in her heart," but Gen. Wallace thinks she did not—that she told Jesus that he was to be the Christ, and so made any further boyhood for him impossible. He has done his best to make his book as agreeable to Roman Catholics as to Protestants. He tells us that he is with Cyril against Nestorius in their great controversy, and that he has a kindly feeling for Pope Gregory because he made it lawful to call Mary the "Mother of God," and with the worship of Mary he has "no quarrel." The bathos of the book reaches its lowest depth when Byron's line,

"Soft eyes looked love to eyes that spoke again,"

is quoted as if pertinent to the relations of Jesus and his mother. But worst of all is the 100th page, where one of the boys has asked the meaning of the term "my Father's business." The answer is substantially, though it is couched in polysyllabic rhetoric, that the Father's business is something with which we have no concern.

The Five Talents of Woman. By the author of 'How to be Happy though Married.' Charles Scribner's Sons. 1888. 8vo, pp. 301.

We often wonder where those women live who like to think of themselves as having been created for the purpose of making man's existence pleasant to him. It is plain that there must be such women, from the fact that one now and then comes upon books written expressly for them; but it is probable that they are to be found in the inland towns, and that they attend the good old-fashioned orthodox churches. It has never been our fortune to number them among our personal acquaintances. Most American women have rather the opposite way of thinking: they believe that the world was made for them, and that it is the function of man to provide ways for them to enjoy the pleasures of living. A juster way than either, and one less likely to wound the sensibilities of men or women, is to consider, as the older theologians ought in consistency to have done, that both were created for the glory of God, and that each is forbidden, by a high sense of duty, from making the other the sole end of his existence.

The style of the author of 'The Five Talents of Women' has not the dignity and moderation that one usually expects to find in a writer on morals. One is at a loss to know what his nationality may be: from such phrases as "the American Girls' University at Vassar," one would infer that he is, as he seems to be, an Englishman, or more probably a Scotchman; but why should his book be largely made up of quotations from obscure American newspapers? This question is hard to answer.

One chapter in the book—that on bravery—is admirable. There is one story which is given as authentic, and which is alone almost a sufficient excuse for the existence of the book. It is this:

"A herd of wild cattle was being driven through the town [of San Diego]. A little child was playing in the street not far from the spot where the cattle were passing, when one of the bulls—a huge creature with large horns—made a sudden rush at the poor bairn. To add to the terror of the scene, the drover was tipsy, and in trying to turn the furious animal he fell off his horse. Warning yells arose from the spectators, as they beheld the terrible fate from which, as it seemed, nothing could save the child. At this very moment a lady happened to come into the street, and the noise of the tumult at once attracted her attention. She saw the child's appalling danger at a glance, and immediately sprang into the empty saddle. She succeeded in catching up with the wild bull, and threw her shawl over its head just as it was about to charge the child. She then, without leaving the saddle, lifted the child to her lap, and took it away to a place of safety. This brilliant act of bravery awoke round after round of hearty applause from every one who witnessed it. . . . As was said at the time, this gallant deed of Miss Lawrence's—for such was the lady's name—was not only heroic, but a feat of horsemanship which few people could equal."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

Andrews—Stoddard. A Grammar of the Latin Language. Revised by Henry Preble. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $1.12.
Bertram, the Prince: An Idyl. Philadelphia.
Besant, W. All Sorts and Conditions of Men: An Impossible Story. Harper & Bros.
Converse, Rev. J. B. The Bible and Land. Morristown, Tenn.: The Author. $1.
Daudet, A. One of the "Forty." Continental Publishing Corporation.
De Salis, Mrs. Dressed Game and Poultry à la mode. Longmans, Green & Co. 60 cents.
Eggleston, E. The Household History of the United States and its People. D. Appleton & Co.
Elliot, Hon. H. The Life of Sidney, Earl of Godolphin, K. G., Lord High Treasurer of England, 1702 to 1710. Longmans, Green & Co. $5.
Garman, S. On the Lateral Canal System of the Selachia and Holocephala. Cambridge.
Hamilton, H. Virgil's Æneid. The First Six Books, Translated into English Rhyme. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $1.25.
Holden, W. Autobiography of Life. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Co.
Lampman, A. Among the Millet, and Other Poems. Ottawa: J. Durie & Son.
Lazarus, Emma. Poems. 2 vols. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. $2.50.
Lietze, E. Modern Heliographic Processes: A Manual of Instruction in the Art of Reproducing Drawings, Engravings, Manuscripts, etc., by the Action of Light. D. Van Nostrand Co. $3.
National Educational Association: Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, at the meeting in San Francisco, 1888. Topeka: Kansas Publishing House.

"Every child in America should have them."—*New England Journal of Education.*

"The 'Young Folks' Cyclopædia' should be in every juvenile library."—*From a Report of the Connecticut Board of Education.*

YOUNG FOLKS' CYCLOPÆDIA of { *Common Things...$2.50.* / *Persons and Places. $2.50*

HENRY HOLT & CO., Publishers, New York.

SAFE INVESTMENTS.

Capital, $750,000
Surplus, $400,470
Guarantee Strength, $1,150,470

RECORD OF OUR 18 YEARS' BUSINESS.

16,854	Mortgages negotiated, aggregating		$11,768,818
6,942	" in force,	"	6,358,162
9,912	" paid,	"	5,410,656
Interest paid aggregating			3,345,495
Total paid to investors			8,756,151

We have 3,014 patrons, to whom we can refer. We do not claim to do the largest, but the SAFEST business.

SAVINGS DEPARTMENT FOR SMALL AMOUNTS.

Full information furnished by

J. B. WATKINS LAND MORTGAGE CO.,

LAWRENCE, KANSAS, or 3854
New York M'n'g'r, HENRY DICKINSON, 319 Broadway.

THREE NEW BOOKS,

JUST IN TIME FOR THE HOLIDAY SEASON.

1.
By the author of 'Cape Cod Folks.'
LASTCHANCE JUNCTION; Far, Far West. 12mo, cloth, $1.25. A Novel of the West, deeply interesting, humorous, pathetic, natural.

2.
JOHN BROWN. By Hermann Von Holst. Edited by Frank P. Stearns. 12mo, cloth, $1.25. A masterly and impartial criticism of the man and his work.

3.
TEMPTED OF THE DEVIL. Passages in the life of a Kabbalist. 12mo, cloth, $1.50. A most powerful romance destined to make its mark. Historically interesting, and written in a lucid manner, touching the occult investigations of the last century.

For sale by all booksellers, or mailed post free on receipt of price by the publishers,

CUPPLES & HURD,

94 Boylston St., Boston, Mass.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

254 Fifth Avenue, between 28th and 29th Sts., New York.
Importer of Foreign Books, Agent for the leading Paris Publishers, Tauchnitz's British Authors, Teubner's Greek and Latin Classics. Catalogues of stock mailed on demand. A large assortment always on hand, and new books received from Paris and Leipzig as soon as issued.

Garden and Forest

has achieved its conspicuous success because to its practical, scientific, and popular attractions it adds a literary quality which ranks it among serial publications of the highest class. Horticulture, Botany, Landscape Gardening, Forestry.

Weekly. Illustrated. $4.00 a Year.

Write for prospectus of new volume to

Garden and Forest Publishing Co.,

TRIBUNE BUILDING, N. Y.

BROWN, BROTHERS & CO.,

59 WALL STREET.

BILLS OF EXCHANGE.

COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS

Available in all parts of the World.

BOUND SET, AS ALSO ODD VOLS. and numbers of the *Nation* for sale by A. S. CLARK, 34 Park Row, New York City.

CARNEGIE 3854

LICENSED FOR NON-COMMERCIAL USE
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED